

UNIV. OF  
TORONTO  
LIBRARY







Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2007 with funding from  
Microsoft Corporation

## ADVERTISEMENT



It is intended to print annually a series of papers by instructors and students in the several departments of Modern Languages at Harvard University. This first number, issued under the patronage of the University, will show what the general character of the publication is likely to be; but the succeeding numbers will be of greater extent.

F. J. CHILD,

*For the Committee of Publication.*

JUNE 25, 1892.



✓

## THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE ENGLISH ROMAUNT OF THE ROSE.

THE authorship of the fragmentary English version of the *Roman de la Rose* has recently been made the subject of an elaborate monograph by Professor Lounsbury in the second volume of his admirable *Studies in Chaucer* (New York, 1892). Mr. Lounsbury's conclusion is at variance with the prevailing doctrine: he believes that the extant translation is entirely from Chaucer's hand. It is the object of the present paper to test the validity of the processes by which he has arrived at this result.

Mr. Lounsbury praises the translation warmly. It is faithful, he says, but not servile. It shows "great mastery over the speech." The original has been "transformed without being deformed" (II, 16). The purpose of this commendation is of course to suggest that the poem is too good not to be Chaucer's. But such praise is excessive. The translation is at best respectable; it is servile and loose by turns, and by no means free from blunders. In short, if it is Chaucer's, it does him no particular credit; if it is not his, its excellence is not such as to force us to postulate a second Chaucer.

Of the arguments used against the genuineness of the poem, Mr. Lounsbury first takes up that from vocabulary. To his criticism of this dubious criterion all sober-minded scholars will subscribe. The "vocabulary test" is henceforth out of the story.

The argument from dialect is next reviewed. The considerable number of Northern rhymes found in the translation does not seem to Mr. Lounsbury to prove the work spurious. There was then no standard of usage, he contends, and Chaucer, if acquainted with the Northern dialect, would not have scrupled to employ it when he needed a rhyme. His residence for some years at Hatfield, in Prince Lionel's household, must have familiarized him with this dialect: indeed, his knowledge of it, as shown by the conversation of the scholars in *The Reeve's Tale*, "is one of the convincing arguments that Geoffrey Chaucer" of Lionel's household "was Geoffrey

Chaucer the poet.”<sup>1</sup> This comes perilously near the *circulus vitiosus*.<sup>2</sup> Again, Mr. Lounsbury asserts that the translator “pretty certainly spoke the Midland dialect from his birth.” “It is plainly the one which he was accustomed to use,” he adds, “and which in this version he did use. Upon this point there will be no difference of opinion” (II, 38). But Skeat, in a letter elsewhere cited by Mr. Lounsbury,<sup>3</sup> has set up an entirely different theory. According to him, the author of a large part of the translation (the so-called fragment A2) was a Northerner, who, in attempting to write in Chaucer’s dialect, relapsed occasionally into his native habits of speech. This theory, which has the cases of the *Kingis Quair*<sup>4</sup> and *Lancelot of the Laik* (E. E. T. S., 1865) in its favor, accounts for the phenomena quite as well as Mr. Lounsbury’s hypothesis, and does not, like the latter, come into collision with the grammatical and metrical tests. Mr. Lounsbury, who does not notice Skeat’s suggestion, maintains that Chaucer’s own language is not free from Northernisms. In support of this assertion he brings forward the well-known instances of *-es* in the second and third person singular of the indicative in the *Book of the Duchesse* (73, 257) and the *Hous of Fame* (426, 1908).<sup>5</sup> This use of *-es* he calls a “most distinctive peculiarity of the Northern dialect” (II, 46). But *-es* in the second and third person singular is no sign of the Northern dialect. It is, on the contrary, the regular West Midland termination, at home as well in the South-west Midland as in the North-west Midland.<sup>6</sup> Mr. Lounsbury has apparently

---

<sup>1</sup> *Studies*, II, 48.

<sup>2</sup> “We cannot . . . be absolutely sure that the person mentioned in [the household accounts of Prince Lionel] is the poet.” *Studies*, I, 28. “This assumed identification does not partake of the nature of absolute certainty. Yet, in the lack of any evidence to the contrary, it is just and fair to take the ground that the Geoffrey Chaucer of the household roll is the poet.” I, 30.

<sup>3</sup> *Studies*, II, 72. Letter in the *Academy*, July 19, 1890. See also Skeat’s *Postscript on “The Romaunt of the Rose”* in the Chaucer Society’s *Ryme-Index to the Manuscript Texts of Chaucer’s Minor Poems*, pp. x-xvi.

<sup>4</sup> See Skeat’s ed. of *The Kingis Quair* (Scottish Text Soc., 1884), *Introd.*, pp. xxv ff.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Brandl, *Eng. Stud.*, XII, 175.

<sup>6</sup> See Brandl in Paul’s *Grundriss*, II, i, 612-13. Mr. Lounsbury seems to assume that *-th* is the only proper Midland termination for the 3 sing. He has not kept clearly in mind the distinction between East and West Midland.



confused this singular *-es* with the plural *-es* in his employment of it as a criterion. The forms cited by him prove nothing whatever, whether they occur in the *Romaunt* or in Chaucer, — and with this remark a great part of his attack on the dialect test falls to the ground. He has at most shown that the dialect test (so far as it does not concern final *e*<sup>1</sup>) is perhaps not quite decisive by itself. He has neglected to point out, however, that, when used cumulatively with the *-y -ye* and the *-e* test, it contributes no small measure of strength to the contention that the *Romaunt* is not Chaucer's.

Mr. Lounsbury next comes to the *-y -ye* test; and here we must consider his discussion of this criterion in his first volume (I, 388 ff.), since that discussion was evidently conducted with an eye to the present argument. Chaucer's rule is well known: he avoids rhyming *-y* (*largely, by, I*) with *-ye* (*maladye, to lye, in hye*). This rule is not observed in the translation, which shows no less than 53 such rhymes in the 7700 lines that have come down to us. Mr. Lounsbury's attack on this test is skilful. Finding it impossible to discover more than two violations of the rule in the 35,000 lines of Chaucer's genuine verse,<sup>2</sup> he attempts to throw suspicion on the test by alleging a "theoretical difficulty" in applying it, and by calling attention to several words (such as *wey, weye; remedye, remede; chivachie, chivauchee*) that have varying forms (I, 390-91). But the words cited do not affect the relations of the categories under debate; and the "theoretical difficulty," which is concerned with the treatment of *-ye* in the interior of the verse, is purely theoretical and has nothing to do with this question of rhymes. Again, he remarks that, though the ascertained

---

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Lounsbury's treatment of final *e* will be considered later (see below, pp. 6 ff.). It is matter of regret that he did not take up the subject (which of course is of much importance with regard to the question of dialect) at this point. If he had anywhere treated the *-e* test satisfactorily, one would not so much object to his postponing the treatment, if that were convenient; but, as we shall soon see, his omissions are very serious. Mr. Lounsbury's remark that "the regular employment of Midland forms by the translator is positive proof that his occasional employment of Northern ones was not so much an accidental as a deliberate act" (II, 45), is remarkable from more points of view than one.

<sup>2</sup> And one of these is of no consequence, since it occurs in *Sir Thopas*. The other is *sky*, which appears in rhyme both with *-e* and without it, with a difference of meaning, however, as Mr. Lounsbury himself points out, *skye* signifying *a cloud*, while *sky* is used in its present sense.

rules of Chaucerian inflection will explain the occurrence of the adjective *sly* now with *-e* and now without it, still "this explanation will not explain the practice in the case of certain other adjectives, such, for example, as *dry*, which, whether used attributively or predicatively, rhyme always with words of the *-ye* group" (II, 389). This is a curiously ill-chosen example (it is the only one given); for *drye*, A.S. *drýge*, is of course entitled to its *-e* in Chaucer; <sup>1</sup> *sly* belongs to quite another class of words.

In fine, the *-y -ye* test is not in the least shaken by his assaults. It would be hard to find another competent judge of linguistic evidence who would not regard it as well-nigh sufficient, unaided, to exonerate Chaucer from all responsibility on the score of this mediocre translation. When one remembers that this test comes on top of the dialect test, which of itself rendered Mr. Lounsbury's theory highly improbable, the heavy odds against which he is contending becomes at once apparent. To urge that Chaucer did not conform to this rule in his youth is to beg the question, for we have no proof that he disregarded it, unless we assume that this translation is from his pen.

Somewhat similar, though not of so much moment, is the assonance test. The Romaunt has eight or nine assonances in 7700 lines; in Chaucer's 35,000 verses we find but one (*Troil.* ii, 884-6-7). In a previous chapter (I, 394 ff.), Mr. Lounsbury has tried hard to raise this *one* to *three* by defending the rhymes *terme : yerne* in the *Book of the Duchesse* (79-80) (against the certain emendation *erme*) and *clere : grene : quene* in the *Troilus* (v, 9-11-12), where the right reading is undoubtedly *clene* (adverb), as in the John's MS. and the Philipps MS.<sup>2</sup> The "early authorities" to which he appeals in the former case are, in reality, nothing but the 1532 folio and the late insertion in MS. Fairfax, no authorities at all in a matter of this minuteness.<sup>3</sup> His application of the principles of text-criticism is curiously one-sided, and his remarks on the unfamiliarity of assonant rhymes to

<sup>1</sup> Since this comment was written, Professor Skeat has called attention to the same error (*Academy*, Feb. 27, 1892, p. 207).

<sup>2</sup> Since no collation of these two MSS. has been published, Mr. Lounsbury cannot be held accountable with regard to the reading. Skeat has conjectured *clene* (adj.), without, apparently, being aware of the MS. authority for his emendation (*Academy*, Feb. 27, 1892, p. 207).

<sup>3</sup> See Skeat's note on the passage, *Minor Poems*, p. 238.

the eyes and ears of Englishmen of all periods are far from accurate. "The change of *erme* to *yerne*," he argues, "is not a change that a scribe would have been likely to make. That he should turn an assonant rhyme into a syllabic one is quite conceivable. The former is something that has never been really naturalized in English versification. It has been practised at times, but it has never been made familiar. It can be found to some extent in the poetry of the thirteenth century. In the fourteenth its use was already dying out. To most men in any period of our literary history its frequent recurrence, or even its occasional occurrence, would have sounded strangely, not to say unpleasantly. It would be natural, therefore, for many a copyist, in meeting with an assonant rhyme, to infer that a mistake had been made in the proper word," etc., etc. (I, 396). But, in balancing the probabilities as to what a scribe might do, Mr. Lounsbury has forgotten that the scribes (or rather the scribe and the *printer*) with whom he is dealing, were of the sixteenth century, when *erme* was obsolete, and, for that very reason, much more suspicious than an assonant rhyme could have been. For assonances have never been so odious to the English ear as Mr. Lounsbury supposes. Even now they are very apt to occur in a copy of verses by an unpractised hand, and as to their "occasional occurrence" "sounding strangely not to say unpleasantly to most men in any period of our literary history," one is tempted to ask for whom Layamon wrote, for whom the metrical romances were composed, and by whom the popular ballads were sung.

Mr. Lounsbury's criticism of the "strange rhyme" test is, on the whole, sounder. Still, one cannot attach any importance to *saveth : significavit* (Prol. 661-2), to which *David : eructavit* (Sompn. T. 225-6) might have been added. For these rhymes are both of that intentionally humorous character of which the famous *ecclesiastic : a stick* in *Hudibras* (i, 1, 11-12) is the ultimate example. Further *smitted* (Troil. v, 1545) is probably not for *smiten*: it is rather the regular perfect participle of *smitten*; and to assert that *houne* (Troil. iv, 210) is for *hound* is venturesome until it can be shown that *here*, in the same line, is an allowable form for *hare*.<sup>1</sup> But

---

<sup>1</sup> See *Atlantic Monthly*, LXIX, 556, April, 1892. While the present article was preparing for the press Professor Skeat made the same points with regard to



neither the assonance test nor the "strange rhyme" test is of the very first importance: the separatists can do without them both.

The next negative argument, which depends on the translator's disregard of Chaucerian final *e* in rhyme, is not only partly metrical and partly grammatical, but has to do with dialect as well, and is therefore closely connected with the discussion of Northern forms undertaken earlier in the chapter. It is beyond a doubt the most important of the linguistic proofs, and Mr. Lounsbury feels keenly how necessary it is for him to explode it before his theory can get a hearing. Accordingly he has collected much instructive material to illustrate the liberties which Chaucer himself took with final *e*. In particular, he has shown, in an interesting excursus (I, 399 ff.) that one cannot insist on the rule that weak preterites shall not rhyme with weak perfect participles. Four of his examples of such rhymes in Chaucer are mistakes which are corrected in the Appendix (III, 453), but there remain twenty cases in which a weak perfect participle does undoubtedly rhyme with a weak preterite. To these Mr. Lounsbury wishes to add *Sec. Nun's T.* 534, *Leg. G. W.* 1390-1, 1696-7. In the first and second of these cases the weight of MS. authority is in his favor, though in both it is more likely, on text-critical principles, that a scribe should omit a word than that he should insert one. In *Leg. G. W.* 1391, he remarks, "the adjective *goode*, of the definite declension, has to be shorn of its final *e* in pronunciation" if we are

---

*smitted* and *houne* (see his letter in *The Academy*, Feb. 27, 1892, p. 207). No one will deny that *houn* might have been used for *hound*; but the form in the *Troilus* is *houne*, rhyming with *to townne*, and in the petrified phrase *to townne* Chaucer appears to have kept the final *e*. *Houne* (= *hound*) actually occurs in Hausknecht's ed. of *The Sowdone of Babylon*, 164, p. 5, but the editor's note says that the MS. reading "looks like *hound*." In any case, the author of the *Sowdone* probably pronounced the rhyme-word *Rome* as a monosyllable (see Hausknecht's Introd., p. xxxix), so that the *-e* in *houne* is not significant. In *Havelok* (to which Hausknecht refers) we have *lon*, *gol*, etc. (see Skeat's ed. p. xxxvii; and Skeat, *Specimens*, II, 320, v. 261, also cited by Hausknecht), and in the *Towneley Mysteries*, *bon*, *won*, for *bound*, *wound* (200), *fon* for *found* (40), *fon* for *fond*, adj. (80), etc. But all this does not help us with *here*. Mr. Lounsbury's remarks on Gower's rhymes, *Studies*, II, 64, are searchingly examined by Skeat, *Academy*, March 5, 1892, pp. 230-1.

to save the rule by retaining the reading of the Cambridge MS. This is not quite fair. *Good man* is practically a compound. Even in the plural we have *goode men* (-e not sounded), and in the present instance the presence of an inflectional -e breaks in two what is to all intents and purposes a single word. In *Leg. G. W.* 1696-7, it is impossible to agree with Mr. Lounsbury that *wroght* (p.p.) is preferable to *wroghte* (pret.). "An interpretation of the passage can be given," he says, "if [*wroghte*] be treated as a preterite, but it is a forced interpretation." The interpretation which he has in mind is doubtless Skeat's, which takes *wroghte* as third person plural without subject expressed. If this is forced, the same cannot be said of the more obvious explanation, which regards *sege* as the subject of both *lay* and *wroghte*: "The siege (or the besiegers) lay before the city long and accomplished little."

Two passages which Mr. Lounsbury might have added to his list are *Troil.* iii, 233 (*dores were . . . yshette: lette* sbst.: *sette* posuit) and *Troil.* iv, 40 (*bowes bente: mente* 3 pl.: *wente* 3 pl.). But these examples are not significant for a reason that also deprives of their importance several of Mr. Lounsbury's own examples,—the participles are *monosyllabic* (or compounds of monosyllabic forms) and they are *in the plural*. For monosyllabic perfect participles, though Mr. Lounsbury has overlooked the fact, are sometimes inflected in the plural in Chaucer. An indubitable example is "And don thyn hod, thi nedes *spedde* be," *Troil.* ii, 954. The application of this rule deprives Mr. Lounsbury's list of *Parl. F.* 123 (*lettres . . . ywroghte*), of *Troil.* i, 463 (*fledde* pl.), of *Troil.* iv, 1422 (*eres spradde*), of *Troil.* v, 1760 (*whette* pl.), of *M. of L.* 462 (*yën . . . yschette*), of *M. of L.* 1017 (*they ben ymette*). This reduces the significant cases in Chaucer from 20 to 14. The same rule will reduce the significant cases in the *Romaunt* from 7<sup>1</sup> to 5 by the setting aside of *bistadde* (5799) and *straught* (1021). The proportion then stands 14 in 35,000 lines for Chaucer, and 5 in 7700 lines for the *Romaunt*. Of these 5, two show a sort of rhyme of which Mr. Lounsbury's Chaucer list gives no example,—the rhyming of a monosyllabic syncopated weak perfect participle with a weak

---

<sup>1</sup> *Six*, unless *straught* be read in v. 1021, but this emendation is almost certain and is approved by Mr. Lounsbury (II, 69, n. 3).

preterite (*leyd*: *seide*, 4541-2; *wroughte*: *sought*, 4950-1).<sup>1</sup> Before leaving this matter we must notice a curious bit of inconsistency. "It is noteworthy," says Mr. Lounsbury, "that violations of this [participle and preterite] test are more numerous and more pronounced in Chaucer's later work than in his earlier. The influences that were breaking it down were growing stronger, and to them he was more and more disposed to yield" (I, 406). Yet Mr. Lounsbury accounts the *Romaunt* a work of Chaucer's youth, his earliest extant poem.

Besides these categories, Mr. Lounsbury recognizes three other divisions of the *-e* test: (1) the rhyming of an infinitive with the singular of a strong preterite indicative, (2) the rhyming of an infinitive with a weak perfect participle, (3) the rhyming of a strong preterite with a weak one. Of the first class he finds 3 examples in the *Romaunt*, of the second, "just 7," of the third, 1. These, added to the 7 cases just discussed, make a total of 18. Two examples of the second class have been overlooked: *consente* inf.: *with bowe bent* (3311-12), and *to gete*: *are sette* (4828-9).<sup>2</sup> Understanding Skeat to assert that there are *hundreds* of cases that come under these heads, Mr. Lounsbury is indignant at what he regards as reckless exaggeration: "The hundreds of instances have dwindled down to less than a score" (II, 69).

Before discussing this extraordinary discrepancy we may properly consider some of Mr. Lounsbury's notes on these violations of the *-e* test and on certain others which he finds in the *Romaunt*. His aim is, of course, to extenuate these as much as he can. With regard to class 1, it is difficult to see how Mr. Lounsbury can think he has in any way justified such a rhyme as *to tel(le)*: *bifel* (pret. 3 sg.) by quoting from Chaucer a couple of examples of *sey* (pret. sg.): *sey* (inf.). The phonetic development of *telle tel* is not by any means parallel to that of *seye sey*. For *seye* loses its *-e*, which follows a diphthong, much more easily than *telle* can lose its *-e*, which follows a consonant.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Skeat, *Academy*, Feb. 27, 1892, p. 207. Professor Skeat's letter did not meet my eye until these comments on Professor Lounsbury's treatment of the subject had been written.

<sup>2</sup> So perhaps *foryete* inf.: *set* p.p. (3245-6); but *foryete* may possibly be in the imperative (*foryet*).



Again, after registering four instances of *it* rhyming with the infinitive in the *Romaunt* (an admittedly non-Chaucerian usage) (II, 70), Mr. Lounsbury attempts to reckon with the rhymes *sayne* inf. : *attayn* (i.e. *attayne*) inf. (3677), *ben* inf. : *sustene* inf. (5638), *seen* inf. : *wene* subj. (5674), by referring to certain rhymes in Chaucer, namely, *demeine* inf. : *soth for to seyne* (*Hous F.* 959-60)<sup>1</sup> and cases of the inf. *seyne* (i.e. the gerund *to seyne*) with *restreyne* inf. and the like (*Troil.*). Obviously the phenomena are by no means indetical. Yet he concludes with the remark: "If it be contended that the usage [in Chaucer] is based upon the derivation of one of the forms [i.e. *seyne*] from the A.S. gerundial ending *-anne*, it is enough to reply that its occurrence in these cases is not borne out by the poet's practice elsewhere. *At any rate, the same sort of defence will apply to the 'Romance of the Rose'*" (II, 71). There is some confusion here. Chaucer's use of the gerundial *to seyne* is complete justification of the translator's use of a similar form to rhyme with *attayne*, so that no one would think of quoting this rhyme one way or the other in the argument. But this has certainly nothing to do with the rhyme *ben* : *sustene*; for (1) Chaucer uses no gerundial form *to bene*, and (2) in the *Romaunt* passage in question the gerundial form would in any case be inadmissible, the phrase being not *to ben*, but *it may wel ben*. So in the third case, — *seen* inf. : *wene* subj. — where the phrase is not *to sene*, but *we may seen*. After this Mr. Lounsbury adds: "There are, besides, a certain number of other rhymes which might be held to sustain this view of the neglect of the infinitive terminations by the author of this version; but they are all of a more or less doubtful character, and no positive opinion can safely be pronounced in the present state of our knowledge" (II, 71-72). He then gives a single example (*feete* pl. : *lete* inf.), which he thinks is paralleled by *to feete* : *meete* inf. (*M. of L.* 1003). To this he appends the rhyme *entent* : *present*, cited by Skeat as un-Chaucerian, which is justified by a similar one from *M. of L.* 832. And this is the last example given by Mr. Lounsbury under the *-e* test.

We have thus seen that in the treatment of this test Mr. Lounsbury's work is not free from sins of commission, the correction of which puts a new face on some pages of his argument. Such sins of

<sup>1</sup> *Demeine* : *seyen*, as Mr. Lounsbury reads.

commission, however, sink into insignificance by the side of the extraordinary sin of omission to which we must now direct our attention. Mr. Lounsbury has arbitrarily restricted the application of the *-e* test and has neglected to consider *between one and two hundred instances* in which the rhymes of the *Romaunt* run counter to Chaucer's practice with regard to this sound.<sup>1</sup>

Examples are: *wel* adv.: *fele* inf. (1843, 1912, 2239, 3011, 3181, 4583, 4964), *bowe* inf.: *prow* sbst. (1939), *ben* pp.: *wene* sbst. (2045, 2415), *I acorde*: *lord* (2083), *reherce* inf.: *vers* (2343), *soone* adv.: *doon* p.p. (2378), *dighte* inf.: *delit* sbst. (2555), *goon* inf.: *al-lone* (2649), *peyne* sbst.: *reyn* sbst. (2657), *set* p.p.: *gette* pres. subj. 2 sg. (2855), *he hath sen*: *clene* adv. (2921), *more and lasse* pl.: *was* (3045), *al* adv.: *falle* inf. (3113), *were* subj. 3 sg.: *ber* pret. ind. 3 sg. (3127), *seyn* inf. (*not* ger.): *peyne* sbst. (3183), *withoute more*: *hoor* (3195), *grace*: *compas* (3207), *freend*: *sheende* inf. (3219), *hende* adj.: *freend* (3345), *al*: *tale* (3453), *sen* p.p.: *grene* (3631), *shene* adj.: *sen* inf. (3713), *a-newe*: *knew* pret. ind. 3 sg. (3875), *allone*: *gon* p.p. (3963), *allas*: *face* (4123) *cest*: *atte leeste* (4209), *telle* inf.: *fel* adj. (4347), *solas*: *grace* (4429), *let* pret. ind. 3 sg.: *swete* adj. (4557), *thou*: *allowe* inf. (5188), *now*: *I trowe* (5408), *I seye*: *ay* (5364), *they fille*: *til* (5816), *mendiciens* pl.: *presence* (6709).

Not only are scores of cases like these, all of them of vital importance, left undiscussed, but the reader is not even apprised of their existence. The fact that now and then a parallel to some of these violations of rule may be found in Chaucer, does not discredit their testimony; for their character and their numbers demonstrate that they are not the result of occasional license but of habitual disregard or total ignorance of the minutiae of Chaucer's dialect. It is useless to enlarge on this unfortunate omission. Nobody can suppose that Mr. Lounsbury did not know of the existence or the significance of these rhymes. His silence is no doubt due to one of those oversights in handling familiar details to which even careful and conscientious scholars are liable. In any case, the result to the validity of

---

<sup>1</sup> It was of course these instances which Skeat had in mind when he spoke of "hundreds" of examples, though it is no doubt possible to interpret his language as Mr. Lounsbury does.



his conclusions is plain. His attack on the *-e* test is rendered all but nugatory. The test stands unshaken and seems by itself well nigh to settle the question at issue. When used cumulatively with the dialect and the *-y -ye* test, even if assonances and strange rhymes be left out of account, it makes out so strong a case against the possibility of Chaucer's being the author of the extant version that nothing short of external documentary evidence of the most convincing kind would be requisite to turn the scale.

So far I have said nothing of the possibility of distinguishing more hands than one in the English *Romaunt*. Mr. Lounsbury will not hear of such a thing. "The arguments that have been adduced for a dual authorship are so far from convincing," he declares, "that they cannot even be called specious." "The version, as a whole, bears its own overwhelming testimony as to its having come from but one hand" (II, 12). This testimony consists in style,—in "manner." The argument from the inconsistency of calling an important character *Bial-Acoil* in one part of the poem, *Fair-Welcoming* in another<sup>1</sup> is, however, by no means answered by Mr. Lounsbury's summoning the three gray horses from the *Canterbury Tales*.<sup>2</sup> In his introduction, p. xx, Mr. Lounsbury comments on the present "tendency to concede the genuineness of a certain portion" of the *Romaunt*. Nowhere, however, not even in his Appendix, does he mention Kaluza's discovery<sup>3</sup> that the first 1704 lines of the poem contain nothing or next to nothing in violation of the dialect test, the *-e* test, the assonance and "strange rhyme" tests, or the *-y -ye* test. Yet the effect of this state of things on Mr. Lounsbury's theory of the undivided Chaucerian authorship of the translation is worth considering. If Chaucer, as he thinks, made this translation in his youth, before he had purged his lips of Northernisms or formulated his rhyme-system in the matter of *-e*, *-y*, *-ye*, and of assonances, how is it that the first 1704 lines show no variations from the standard of his later poetry in these regards, but that soon after that point is reached the objec-

<sup>1</sup> See Child, *Athenæum*, Dec. 3, 1870, p. 721, for the first mention of this discrepancy; cf. Lindner, *Engl. Stud.*, XI, 170, Kaluza, *Engl. Stud.*, XIII, 528.

<sup>2</sup> *Studies*, II, 12-13. See this answer criticized in *The Atlantic Monthly*, LXIX, 556, April, 1892.

<sup>3</sup> First made public in *The Academy*, July 5, 1890, p. 11. In his Appendix Mr. Lounsbury cites matter published as late as April, 1891.

tionable licenses "come lepard in"? Of course this question may be answered; but any answer that may be given will add one more to the assumptions which Mr. Lounsbury's theory already necessitates.<sup>1</sup>

It is time, however, to come to Mr. Lounsbury's affirmative arguments. These are all internal and are based on similarity or identity of style. "The strongest sort of evidence for [the] genuineness" of the translation, he says, "is [its] Chaucerian character. It is thoroughly impregnated with his peculiarities of style and diction. . . . It uses his words, his phrases, his mannerisms, his methods of transition, and uses them very often in places where there is nothing in the original to suggest the particular form of expression that is employed" (II, 81-82). This strong statement Mr. Lounsbury supports by arguments that may be roughly divided into five classes: (i) the argument from the usage in common of "certain individual words and brief phrases," (ii) the argument from "certain matters found in this translation which do not appear in the original but do appear in Chaucer," (iii) the argument from mannerisms in transition, (iv) the argument from parallel passages, and (v) the argument from synonyms.

I. The argument from the use in common of "certain individual words and brief phrases" depends on the employment by Chaucer and by the translator of words and phrases like *iwis*, *certes*, *parde*, *everichon*, *never-a-del*, *I gesse*, *soth for to seye*, *withouten mo*, and the like. Mr. Lounsbury distinguishes five groups: (1) *iwis*, *certes*, *certein* (adv.), *alas*, *parde*, *del* (in *everi-del*, *never-a-del*, in rhyme), *everi-*

---

<sup>1</sup> It will be observed that we are not here concerned with the truth of Kaluza's theory that the first 1704 lines of the translation are really Chaucer's work, — a theory now accepted by Skeat (see his letter to *The Academy*, Feb. 27, 1892, p. 207). This view Professor Lounsbury regards as "much more untenable than that which denies the genuineness of the translational together" (Introd., p. xx). It certainly is a long saltus from the observation that the first 1704 lines contain no un-Chaucerian rhymes to the conclusion that the first 1704 lines are Chaucer's own, and there are serious difficulties in the way. It is incautious of Professor Brandl to speak as if there were no doubt about the authorship of this part of the poem: "Indem er [Chaucer] den *Rosenroman* übersetzte, eine Arbeit welche . . . nur z. T. (v. 1-1704) erhalten ist," etc. (Paul's *Grundriss*, I, i, 675). We are at present concerned only with the *fact* observed by Kaluza. It is fair to say, however, that there still remain two or three rhymes in this first fragment that are not quite satisfactory.

*chon* (in rhyme). (2) Certain phrases formed with *withouten* (var. *out of*). These he divides into (a) *withouten* (or *out of*) *drede, more, mo, words more (mo)*; and (b) others of similar character which are significant in the lump, not as individuals (II, 92). (3) *Soth (ly) to seye (telle)*, with or without *for, shortly to telle*. (4) *I undertake, dar seye, gesse; trusteth me wel; God wot; by God*. (5) invocatory phrases.

His contention is that the fact that the *Romaunt* and Chaucer agree in their employment of all these phrases is highly significant, especially when it is observed that Gower and Barbour do not agree with Chaucer in their use. Mr. Lounsbury does not deny that these are common phrases. "It would not, therefore, be the fact that a few of these phrases are found in the writings of two distinct authors that would be especially noteworthy. It would be the fact that all of them are found, and are found with about the same degree of frequency in each" (II, 102-3). The argument is, then, a cumulative argument from agreement of vocabulary, and will hardly produce much effect on the mind of a reasoner determined to treat the vocabulary test *pro* with as little respect as Mr. Lounsbury has (and very properly) treated the vocabulary test *con*. The greater part of the words and phrases in question are extremely common in the metrical romances. *Certes* or *iouis* may almost be said to occur on every page; the heroes of these poems are quite as fond as Chaucer's heroes of *alas*, the compounds of *-del* abound in rhyme, and the phrases *withouten doute, withouten drede, withouten lesyng*, etc., are only too obtrusive. It is surprising that Mr. Lounsbury, who is fully aware of the fundamental difference between the easy-going style of Chaucer and the primness of Gower,<sup>1</sup> should have missed the true significance of Chaucer's use of these words and phrases in its relation to their use by the translator. "It," he remarks, in one place, speaking of *I dare say*, "like many of the expressions that have already been considered, would never be much used by any author save one who moved persistently on low levels, and ordinarily kept close to the language of daily life" (II, 99). We have here a perfect explanation of the correspondence between Chaucer and the

---

<sup>1</sup> See Professor McClumpha's remarks on this subject, *Mod. Lang. Notes*, VII, 167, March, 1892.



translator, — they were both authors who ordinarily kept close to the language of daily life; and we have, at the same time, a perfect explanation of the discrepancy between these two authors on the one hand and Gower on the other, — it was Gower's desire to talk like a book, rather than to be colloquial, and his primness found expression in the discarding of some colloquial tags and the sparing employment of others. The metrical romances, however, are garrulous and intended to be popular. In them, accordingly, we find used abundantly most of the words and phrases in question. The wonder is not at finding these phrases in any given case, but at *not* finding them. If Mr. Lounsbury could have shown, for example, that neither Chaucer nor the translator had used *iwis* and *certes*, he would have made a strong point. That they both used them freely, means little more than that they both spoke the same language.

Attaching as I must no weight to Mr. Lounsbury's five classes just enumerated, I shall content myself with pointing out a few errors in details. We may then pass to more important matters. "*Certein* as an adverb," remarks Mr. Lounsbury, "seems to be confined to Chaucer and the *Romance*" (II, 544). But *certein* is common enough: see, e.g., *Yw.*<sup>1</sup> 228, 503, 511; *A. and M.* 5243, 7632, 8206; *Rich.* 3933, 4172; *Tars* 138, 933; *Al.* 6805; *Am.* 861; *Ath.* 795; *Oct.*

---

<sup>1</sup> *A. and M.*, Arthour and Merlin, ed. Kölbing; *Adam*, in Laing, *Peniworth of Witte*, etc.; *Al.*, Kyng Alisaunder, in Weber, I; *Amadace*, Sir Amadace, in Robson, *Three Early Eng. Metrical Romances*; *Amadas*, Sir Amadas, in Weber, III; *Ath.*, Athelston, ed. Zupitza, *Engl. Stud.*, XIII; *Ber.*, Tale of Beryn, ed. Furnivall and Stone, Chaucer Soc.; *Bev.*, Sir Beues of Hamtoun, ed. Kölbing, Auchinleck MS.; *Bev. B.*, the same, Chetham MS.; *Bödd.*, Böddeker, *Altengl. Dichtungen des MS. Harl. 2253* (cited by pages); *C. A.*, *Confessio Amantis* (cited by the pages of Morley's edition followed in each case by the volume and page of Pauli's); *Ch.*, Chaucer; *Chestre*, Thomas Chestre's *Launfal*; *Chron.*, *Chronicle of England*, in Ritson, II; *Cleges*, Sir Cleges, in Weber, I; *Cursor M.*, *Cursor Mundi*; *Degarre*, Sir Degarre, ed. Laing; *Degrev.*, Sir Degrevant, ed. Halliwell, *Thornton Romances*; *Destr. Troy*, *Gest Hystoriale of the Destruction of Troy*, ed. Panton and Donaldson; *Eglam.*, Sir Eglamour of Artois, ed. Halliwell, *Thornton Romances*; *Fer.*, Sir Ferumbras, ed. Herrtage; *Flor.*, Floris and Blanchefeur, ed. Hausknecht; *Florence*, Bone Florence de Rome, in Ritson, III; *Freine*, Lay le Freine, in Weber, I; *Gam.*, Tale of Gamelyn, ed. Skeat; *Gen.*, Generydes, ed. W. Aldis Wright; *Guy* (A.), Guy of Warwick, ed. Zupitza, Auchinleck MS.; *Guy* (Caius), same, Caius MS.; *Guy* (Univ.), same, second version, Camb. Univ. Library MS.; *Havel.*, Havelok the Dane, ed. Skeat; *Horn*,

*A.* 1700, 1895; *Ip. A.* 7656; *Perc.* 452; *Sowd.* 1249, 1453, 1525; *Wars Al.* 183; *Lib.* 1808, 1852, 2051; *Bev.* 3599; *Bev. B.* 1089, 3128, 3698; *Chest.* 60, 456, 645; *Par.* 1447, 4960, 7235; *Ber.* 99; *Gen.* 1146, 2139, 2145, 2296; *Townel.* 160, 161, 173; etc. — At p. 93 Mr. Lounsbury suggests that *withouten wene* may be "specially characteristic of the Northern dialect." The phrase, however, is by no means specially Northern: see *Ip. A.* 3586, 3916, 4648, 4932, 8581, 8772; *Rich.* 1755, 5358; *Mel.* 222, 709, 834; *Chestre* 697, 851; *Ath.* 680; *Perc.* 1987, 2230; *Lib.* 1571; *A. and M.* 9808; *Fer.* 2642; *Ot.* 1110; *Flor.* 197, 1085; *Oct. A.* 643. — On *I undertake* in the sense of *I venture to say*, we have this comment: "This usage of the verb could never have been widespread. It probably was always a very limited one" (II, 98). Yet *undertake* in this sense is found in *Beves B.* 2889, in *Beryn* 522, in *Ip. A.* 317, 752, 1538, in *Par.* 524, 1293, 3323, 3793, 5349, 5433, 6069, and several times in the *Confessio Amantis*, 118, I, 215; 245, II, 205; 307, II, 383; 395, III, 244 (cf. *Studies*, II, 109); and these works cover a time of a hundred years and a space extending from Lincolnshire to Kent. — Still more surprising is Mr. Lounsbury's note on *by God*: "However frequently it may have been heard on the lips of [Chaucer's] contem-

---

King Horn, ed. Lumoy; *Ip. A.*, *Ip. B.*, Ipomedon, ed. Kölbing; *Isumbr.*, Sir Isumbras, ed. Halliwell, *Thornton Romances*; *Launf. (R.)*, Launfal, Rawlinson Version, *Am. Jour. Philol.*, X; *Lib.*, Libeaus Desconus, ed. Kaluza; *Mel.*, Sege off Melayne, ed. Herrtage; *Orfeo*, Sir Orfeo, ed. Zielke; *Oct. A.*, Octavian, ed. Sarrazin, Southern Version; *Oct. B.*, the same, Northern Version; *Ot.*, Duke Rowlande and Sir Ottuell, ed. Herrtage, *Charlemagne Romances*, II; *Ot. B.*, Sir Otuel, ed. Herrtage, *Charl. Rom.*, VII; *Par.*, Partonope of Blois, ed. Buckley, Roxburghe Club; *Perc.*, Sir Perceval of Galles, ed. Halliwell, *Thornton Romances*; *Poema Mor.*, Poema Morale, ed. Lewin; *P. Pl.*, Piers Plowman, ed. Skeat, 2 vols., Oxf., 1886; *Pol. Rel. and Love P.*, Political, Religious, and Love Poems, ed. Furnivall; *Pr. Cons.*, Hampole's Pricke of Conscience, ed. Morris; *Praise of Women*, in Laing, *A Peniworth of Witte*, etc., Abbotsford Club; *Reinb.*, Reinbroun, ed. Zupitza (at the end of *Guy*), cited by stanzas; *Rich.*, Richard Coer de Lion, in Weber, II; *Sowd.*, Sowdone of Babylone, ed. Hausknecht; *Torrent*, Torrent of Portyngale, ed. Adam; *Townel.*, Towneley Mysteries, Surtees Soc. (cited by pages); *Trist.*, Sir Tristem, ed. Kölbing; *Tryam.*, Sir Tryamour, ed. Halliwell, Percy Soc.; *Vern.*, Roland and Vernagu, ed. Herrtage, *Charl. Rom.*, VII; *York Plays*, ed. Miss Toulmin Smith (cited by pages); *Wars Al.*, Wars of Alexander, ed. Skeat; *Wil.*, William of Palerne, ed. Skeat; *Yw.*, Ywain and Gawain, ed. Schleich.

poraries, he seems to have been the only one to employ it in literature" (II, 100). The oath occurs in *Piers Plowman* (e.g., *Prol.* 209; B. ii, 127; B. v, 92) and again and again in the romances (see, e.g., Kölbing, *Ipom.*, p. CXII) and is not unknown to Gower (*C. A.*, 279, II, 301).

To his five classes of "individual words and brief phrases" Mr. Lounsbury has appended a catalogue of seventeen phrases, with the following introduction: "There are, in addition, a number of special phrases which are employed both by Chaucer and by the [translator]. Most of them are somewhat peculiar. They were not of a kind to be widely current. Some belonging to the list must have been confined to the speech of a very small class. . . . Here are some of the most remarkable" (II, 113-14). Notwithstanding this preface, most of the phrases enumerated are common idioms. Thus, —

1. *To quite (one's) while.* Cf. And so wyll he quyte your while, *Guy* (Caius) 8847; Y wil . . . thy whyle wel aquyte, *Fer.* 687; Y schel ones aquyte hur wyle, *Fer.* 3298; And wele he ȝalt him his while, *Guy* (A.) 927; ȝolden thou hast me iuel mi while, id. 4405; Mi while is iuel ȝalt, id. 4408: Euel he hath is while ȝolde, *Reinh.* 21; It ȝelt hem euele her wile, *Pol. Rel. and Love Poems*, p. 237; Thow miȝt ȝilden is while, *Bev.* 3004; And that he hadde for is while, *Bev.* 3297. In *C. A.* 272, II, 282: That I thy wile quite may, *wile* seems to be the modern *wile*, not a mistake for *while*.

2. *For wod = like mad.* Cf. Route and drive al for wode, *Sarmun* 122, Mätzner, *Sprachpr.*, I, i, 118, who quotes, — Hit leide on for wod, *St. Edm. the Conf.* (ed. Furnivall) 370. Expressions in which *for* governs an adjective are not uncommon. Examples are: His hors myght vnnethe goo for lene, *Ip. A.* 6240; What for wery and what for faynt, Sir Beuys was nerehande attaynt, *Bev. B.* 2449-50; That him ne thorst yt not wyte For febyl his dynt to smyte, *Rich.* 777-8; I grant . . . I am overcumen in this batail For pure ataynt and recreant, *Yw.* 3279-81; Aboute the place lay a dicke, For brodder and depper was none it liche, *Bev. B.* 1137-8; Thai hem hadde laid for hot In the cartes, *A. and M.* 4867-8; The bischoppe loughe for fayne, *Mel.* 1104: Sich panys hard never man telle For ugly and for felle, *Townel.* 143; For syk unethes myghte he stonde, *Wife's Prol.* 394; For pure ashamed she Gan yn here hed to pulle, *Troil.* ii, 656-7; Though that a man, for feblesse of his eyen, May not en-



dure on it to se for bryght, id. ii, 124. Some of these passages make it probable that in *The Knight's Tale* 1284 (colblak for old) we should read "for old" separatim, not regarding *for* as a prefix, and so in 1286 (As any ravenes fethere it shoon for blak). Similarly: Amidde a tree *for drye* as whyt as chalk, *Sq. T.* 401, rather than *fordrye*, unless the Ellesmere reading *fordryed* be preferred.<sup>1</sup>

3. *To conne thank.* This idiom had a continuous existence in English for at least six hundred years (1000-1600) and is still alive in some dialects: see Murray s.v. and Mätzner, and add *Poema Mor.* 71, *Havel.* 2560, *Guy* (A.) 4091, *Bev.* 1292, *C. A.* 109, I, 193, Ascham's *Toxophilus*, p. 31 (Arber).

4. *To go or ride.* Another very common phrase. For examples, in its various forms *ride and (or, ne, no, nether) go, go and ride*, see *Guy* (A.) 5700, 7176; *Al.* 3522, 5092; *Bev.* 327; *Bev. B.* 21, 704; *Fer.* 2847; *Yw.* 873; *Ip. A.* 1164 (where see Kölbing); *Isumbr.* 56; *Sowd.* 1474; *Ot. B.* 63, 256, 421, 694; *Cleges* 462; *Gam.* 312; *Ber.* 719, 1626; *Par.* 2973; Skelton, Riverside ed., notes, pp. 51, 236, 387, 421.

5. *To love paramours.* In the single place quoted from the *Romaunt*, 4657, Ne never ilovede paramours = Ne james par amor n'amasses, I, 140. Cf. Y louede a clerk al par amours, *Bödd.* p. 173; to loue paramowers, *Ip. A.* 2131, 2448. The same phrase, with *par amour* (in various spellings) in the singular occurs often: see *A. and M.* 2479, 8662; *Oct. A.* 117; *Flor.* 218, 266, 903; *Fer.* 1303; *Bev.* 35; *Tryam.* 1370; *Ber.* 68; *Par.* 4210. See also Mätzner, s.v. *amour*.

6. *To dyen in the peyne* (which means rather *though one should die in the torment of it* than, as Mr. Lounsbury interprets it, *to die under torture*). The only case quoted from the *Romaunt*, Me were lever dye in the peyne, 3326, translates Ge vodroie morir ainçois, I, 101. Cf. In payne tharfor to daye, *Fer.* 1285. Entirely analogous in construction and meaning are the following: To suffer ded, *Yw.* 1089 (where see Schleich); ded to be, *Guy* (A.) 360; to dye er ich thennes go, id. 3834; to dye tharfore, *Fer.* 5850; to be ded ther, id.

<sup>1</sup> I am indebted to Mr. Edward Fulton, of the Graduate School of this University, for calling my attention to two examples of this construction which I had overlooked.

5752; therefore to ben asleyn, id. 1537; for to life or dy, *Yw.* 1168, *Townel.* 122; mi liif to lese, *Guy* (A.) 4272.

7. *At poynt devis.* Cf. *Par.* 4822, 5424; *Gen.* 3307; and see Nares s.v. *point device*, Schmidt, *Shak. Lex.*, Hazlitt, *Early Pop. Poetry*, III, 117.

8. *To blere (one's) eye* = to deceive. See Mätzner, s.v. *bleren*; and add *Ip. A.* 1835, *Oct. A.* 1217, *Lib.* 1523, *Fer.* 507, *Sev. Sages* (Wright) 2952, *Ber.* 445. Very common.

9. *As he (she, etc.) were wood.* An extremely common comparison. Examples may be seen in *Trist.* 2357 (where see Kölbing); *Oct. A.* 1304; *Oct. B.* 929; *Bev.* 1010, 4210; *Bev. B.* 4125; *Rich.* 276, 463, 1796, 2653, 3191, 6981; *Havel.* 508, 1777, 1896, 2609, 2661; *Flor.* 719; *Am.* 806; *A. and M.* 7390; *Fer.* 3941, 3980; *Ip. A.* 7897, 8182 (where see Kölbing); *Ot. B.* 168, 814, 970, 1124, 1354; *Vern.* 639; *Tryam.* 310; *Ber.* 1006. See also Kölbing, *Amis*, p. LIV, and Zupitza's note on *Athelston* 250, *Engl. Stud.* XIII, 374. (Cf. note on ii. 37, below.)

10. *With sory grace.* Cf. with sory grace, *Mel.* 671; wyth yule gras, *Fer.* 2443, 2979.

11. *Take it not agrief.* Cf. takes not agreve, *Degrev.* 467; tok hit . . . agref, *Al.* 3785; that ye take it not at greffe, *Ip. B.* 197; tok it to na greve, *Yw.* 3127; took it to greef, *Rich.* 4660; that thou ne take it noȝt to gref, *Fer.* 2628, cf. 5805; take noȝte on greue, *Amadace* 39; take they in gryef, *Par.* 6664; tak it to no grefe, *Townel.* 114, cf. 176; tak to no grevance, *Yw.* 126. (See Murray, s.v., and Kölbing on *Ip. A.* 870.)

12. *Farwel feldefare.* This is a proverbial saying and therefore proves nothing. It has been in use in recent times and is perhaps not yet extinct. See Hazlitt, *Proverbs and Proverbial Phrases*, 1869, p. 128, and cf. Mrs. Haweis, *Belgravia*, XLVIII (1882), 164.

13. *Though (one) hadde it sworn.* Cf. thei thai it hadde al yswore, *A. and M.* 1011; theȝ al the men . . . hadde hit . . . iswore, *Flor.* 626; thank ich heuede isworen hit, *Ancren Riwele*, ed. Morton, p. 96; thah ha hit hefden sworn, *Hali Meidenhad*, p. 31, quoted by Mätzner, *Sprachpr.*, I, ii, 31; thofe the rede knyghte hadde sworne, *Perc.* 61; thah he hade swore, *Bödd.* p. 103; though thou haddest swore, *Gam.* 302; yf that the deuyll had sworne, *York Plays*, p. 148; had the dwylle hit sworne, *Townel.* 68; if the dewylle of helle



had sworne, id. 127; iff he had sworne, *Bone Florence* 806; if he had sworne, Hazlitt, *Early Pop. Poet.*, III, 116; though thou hadst sworne, id., IV, 128; maugre if they had sworne, *Bev. B.* 3157; thouȝ men the contrary swer, *Ber.* 86, cf. *Sq. T.* 325; I sal anis drink or I ga, thocht thou had sworne my deid, Lyndesay, *Three Estaits*, 1949, E. E. T. S., p. 449; theyȝe men hadden his deth sworn, *Bev.* 2345.

14. *In soothfastnes*. I have no examples of the use of this phrase at hand, but it is surely nothing extraordinary.

15. *In wordes few*. Cf. at wordes fewe, *Rich.* 571, 3081, *Guy* (A.) 2750, 4412; at wurde fewe, *Guy* (A.) st. 66; at fewe wordes, *Freine* 279; at schorte wordes, *Rich.* 2793.

16. *With mischaunce*. See the same phrase in *Guy* (A.) 2533, *Sowd.* 2154, *Par.* 4698; with a myschaunce, *Rich.* 5412, *Townel.* 223; withe a mekille myschaunce, *Townel.* 199.

17. *Je vous die*. Of the frequency with which this phrase was heard in conversation and of its intelligibility to all orders we may judge as well from the fact that the Friar uses it to the churl Thomas and his wife in *The Sompnour's Tale* (124, 130) as from the fact that it is twice employed in *Arthour and Merlin* (5913, 6546), a romance written, as the author expressly informs us (19-29), for those who knew no French. Cf. also *Al.* 79.

The above notes make it clear that Mr. Lounsbury's position with regard to these seventeen phrases is untenable. "There is no easy way," he sums up, "of avoiding the natural inference from these resemblances. It is hardly reasonable, it is actually unreasonable, to draw any other than that the expressions were due to the same hand or were imitated by the one from the other" (II, 117). Surely, in view of the additional parallels that I have cited, which could easily be multiplied, it is not unreasonable to suppose that these phrases were a part of the every-day literary (and doubtless also of the every-day popular) vocabulary of Chaucer's century.

Mr. Lounsbury's next important note (for *mafay* and the double form *stak*, *stiked* cannot be regarded as of any consequence) concerns *if I may* in the sense of *if I can help it*.<sup>1</sup> This occurs in

<sup>1</sup> This use is merely a variety of the ordinary *if I may* = *if I have any power in the matter, so far as lies in my power* (see Zupitza on *Guy* 983, Herrtage on

Chaucer (*M. of L. Prol.* 89, *Frankl. T.* 690) and also in the *Romaunt*, and he is inclined to attach some weight to this coincidence. But he cites only one passage from the *Romaunt* (3099): the phrase occurs also in v. 635, in the same sense, and here it is a mere translation of the French original, — *si je puis*. This fact would destroy the significance of the parallel, even if this use of *if I may* were not found elsewhere.<sup>1</sup> That it is so found is shown by the following passages :

He says : "Thai ne sal, so God me rede,  
For al thaire might, do me to dede  
Ne no handes opon me lay."  
Sho said : "Na, sertes, *if that I may*." *Yw.* 713-16.

Ye sal noght so, *yf that I may*. *Yw.* 2527.

Thou ne sschalt neuere after that day  
Despice freinchs man, *zef ich may*. *Otuel B.* 289-90.

I wolde not warre, *yf y myght*,  
But holde my londe wyth lawe and ryght.

*Guy* (Univ.) 3529-30.

Indeed the idiom seems to have survived to the Elizabethan age.

For, *if we may*,

We'll not offend one stomach with our play.

*Henry V.*, act ii., Chorus, 39-40.

*Otuel* 880). The peculiar implication in the cases cited (*if I can help it*) comes not from ellipsis, but from the negative character of the main clause. Cf. the same phrase with a positive apodosis: He sschal abugge, *zef ich may*, *Ot. B.* 880; For he . . . shall be the ferste That shall be dede, if that I may, *C. A.*, 118, I, 215. When the subject of the protasis is the same as that of the apodosis (as in: I schall the *zylde yf that y may*, *Guy* (Univ.) 1870), it is not always possible to distinguish this idiom from the ordinary use of *may* with an ellipsis of the infinitive (*yf that y may zylde the*). There is less uncertainty about *It shalle be done, lord, if I may*, *Townel.* 121, but even here the *may* may be thought to imply an ellipsis of *do it* (from the preceding *be done*). — *Though he had sworn* is in some respects analogous to *if I may*. It perhaps means merely *though he had taken an oath about the matter, though the contrary* is sometimes added. In a well-known difficult passage in *The Winter's Tale*, i, 2, 424, "Swear his thought over" seems to signify "Take an oath over and over again with regard to his opinion that you are guilty," and it is left to the reader to infer that the oath will be in the negative, denying the "thought" of Leontes.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *The Atlantic Monthly* LXIX, 556.

II. The argument from "certain matters found in [the] translation which do not appear in the original but do appear in Chaucer." Three such matters are specified.

1. "The somewhat unsavory fate with which Constrained-Abstinence threatens Wicked-Tongue he is eventually to be visited (7577-8) has nothing whatever to support it or to suggest it in the French poem. No reader of the prologue to the *Summoner's Tale* needs to be told, however, what it was that the translator had in mind" (II, 119). The French has *Vous en ires ou puis d'enfer*, II, 50; the translation, *For thou shalt for this synne dwelle Right in the devels ers of helle*. The desperate attempt of Lindner, *Engl. Stud.*, XI, 171, to explain this as a blunder does not help us. Still it seems impossible to extract from this coincidence much assistance for Mr. Lounsbury's case. Surely he does not think that Chaucer *invented* the story of the future home of all friars. Such stories, as Mr. Lounsbury himself insists with much cogency when dealing with certain attempts to trace Chaucer's "sources," were in the air. And if Chaucer did invent the story, what was to prevent the translator from alluding to it? We are not to be identified with all the authors to whom we allude. But, further, is it so certain that the translator is alluding to this particular story? There is evidence enough that the phrase which he substitutes for *puis d'enfer* was familiar to our ancestors. It is something of a favorite with the foul-mouthed Cain of the *Towneley Mysteries* (see p. 14, ll. 16, 37, and cf. p. 9, l. 27), and it was the name by which the celebrated Peak Cavern, in Derbyshire, was known in Camden's time (*Britannia*, ed. of 1607, p. 421),<sup>1</sup> though modern euphemism has substituted "Devil's Cave."

2. The use of India as a limit of remoteness by Chaucer and by the translator is commented on, and Chaucer's

For I ne can not fynde

A man, *though that I walked into Inde* (*Pard. T.* 259-60)

is compared with the translator's

For swetter place

To pleyen ynnē he may not fynde,

*Al-though he sought oon in-tyl Ynde* (622-4).

<sup>1</sup> The first edition was published in 1586.

Here the original has

Car plus bele place  
Ne plus biau leu por soi joer  
Ne porroit-il mie trover (I, 20),<sup>1</sup>

India not being mentioned. But all significance vanishes from this parallel when it is observed (1) that *to India* is a commonplace in Middle English for *a long way off*, (2) that *fynde* is an inevitable translation for *trover*, (3) that *fynde* and *Inde* are traditional rhymes, and (4) that *Havelok the Dane* and *Partonope* contain a line exactly parallel to that quoted from the *Romaunt*. Quotations<sup>2</sup> in support of these positions are :

Ich wile feche him, mowe thow him fynde,  
Thouȝ he be bi-ȝende Ynde! *Bev.* 1275-6.

Hennes to the londe off Ynde  
Better thenne [they] schalt thou non fynde, *Rich.* 1633-4.

Betwene this and the lond of Ynde  
ȝif a be, y schal hym fynde, *Reinb.* 24.

One of hem ich herie best  
From Irland in to Ynde, *Bödd.* p. 166.

Off all hethene land, I fynde,  
Fro the Grekysche see to Gret Ynde, *Rich.* 6543-4.

Comyn he ys oute of Ynde,  
A feller thefe shuld no man fynde, *Guy* (Caius) 7764-5.

From henne to Ynde that cite, *Guy* (A.) st. 88.

The two decisive passages are these :

*Thou* (= *though*) *y southe hethen into Ynde*,  
So fayr, so strong ne mithe y finde, *Havel.* 1085-6.

A symlyer no where con ye not fynde,  
*Though ye sought hens to Ynde*,<sup>3</sup> *Par.* 7457\*-8\*, p. 290.

<sup>1</sup> In citing the *Roman* I have referred to Michel's edition by volume and page; in citing the *Romaunt* I have used the Aldine verse-numbers.

<sup>2</sup> Some of these have already been cited by Kölbing in his notes to *Ip. A.* 182 and *Trist.* 2900, but not with reference to the *Romaunt* or to Chaucer.

<sup>3</sup> Kölbing's reading. Buckley's edition has *yende*.



3. The variation between the original and the translation in the following passage seems to Mr. Lounsbury highly significant.

Moult est chetis et fox naïs  
 Qui croit que ci soit son païs.  
 N'est pas nostre païs en terre ;  
 Ce puet l'en bien des clers enquerre  
 Qui Boëce de Confort lisent  
 Et les sentences qui la gisent,  
 Dont grans biens as gens laiz feroit  
 Qui bien le lor translateroit, I, 168.

He is a foole withouten were  
 That trowith have his countre heere.  
 In erthe is not oure countre :  
 That may these clerkis seyn and see  
 In Boice of Consolacioun,  
*Where it is maked mencion*  
*Of oure countre pleyn at the eye,*  
*By teching of philosophie,*  
 Where lewid men myghte lere witte,  
 Who-so that wolde translaten it, 5661-69.

Of the lines (here italicized) inserted in this passage by the translator, Mr. Lounsbury makes much. They prove, he thinks, that the translator "knew the work of Boethius as well as he knew the *Roman*." And, coupled with the fact that the *metrum* of Boethius here referred to was a favorite with Chaucer, they also show that Chaucer and the translator were "in one instance, at least, admirers of the very same passage in" the *De Consolatione Philosophiae*. These conclusions do not seem to me sound ; for the translator's rather feeble remark does not contain anything that he might not have inferred from the context of the *Roman* without ever having seen the work of Boethius. And even if they were sound, they would not signify. Chaucer was not the only reader of Boethius in the fourteenth century. The *De Consolatione* is well known to have been a favorite book with the men of his time. The fact that two English parliamentary orators of the old school were caught quoting the same ode of Horace could scarcely be cited in proof of their having written each other's speeches.

III. The argument from identical mannerisms in transition is supported by a short list of nine lines from the *Romaunt* (such as, "These briddes that I you devise"). Of these it is remarked: "No one who is familiar with Chaucer's writings needs to be told that these lines are in his manner, and that they bear a close similarity to many that are found in his admittedly genuine works. It is perfectly legitimate to take the ground that they were imitations. It is not legitimate to explain their appearance on the assumption that they were produced independently by two different authors" (II, 122). Now five out of these nine verses need no explanation except such as is furnished by a comparison with the French. These are "These briddes that I you devise," 670 (Cil oisel que je vous devise, I, 22), "Tho myghtist thou karoles sene," 759 (Lors veissiés carole aler, I, 24), "Now come I to my tale ageyn," 999 (Or revendrai a ma parole, I, 32), "Now have I told thee in what wise," 2717 (Or t'ai dit comment n'en quel guise, I, 84), "Now is it tyme shortly that I," 4145 (Des or est drois que ge vous die, I, 125),—and the other four are trifling matters which belong not to the characteristic phraseology of Chaucer, but to the general story-telling phraseology of his century.

Of the "method of leaving a subject by putting the refusal to go on in the shape of an interrogatory" Mr. Lounsbury says: "This is one of Chaucer's most distinctive mannerisms." "Yet this very mannerism," he adds, "makes its appearance in the *Romance of the Rose* in such lines as: 'What shulde I more to you devise?'" That this fashion of transition is a mannerism nobody will deny. That it is a mannerism especially characteristic of Chaucer I cannot admit. For it is extremely common in Middle English. A few examples will suffice: Wat halt it to telle longe? *Rob. Glouc.* in Mätzner, *Sprachpr.*, I, i, 159, v. 164; What helpeth al to telle? *Al.* 6826; What helpeth it lenger yteld, id. 7870; What helpeth it make tale long? *A. and M.* 3055; What gette it al to tellen here? id. 4025; Where to schuld y that devise? id. 6522; Wharto scholde that may discrive? *Bev.* 523; What helpeth hit to make fable? id. 2147; Wherto shuld y make a tale of nought? *Guy* (Caius) 2189, cf. *Guy* (A.) 4783; Wharto schuld ich 3ou telle more? *Guy* (A.) 3565; What schuld y make tale mucche? id. 3593; Wharto schuld ich tale telle? id. 3625; Wharto schuld ich held long tale? id. 5345; Where to shuld y of

more discrye? *Guy* (Caius) 7387; What help mo tales teld? *Lib.* 973. (See also Kölbing on *Trist.* 918, where Mätz. l.c. is referred to.) But this fashion is not even "a distinctive mannerism" of Middle English. It is well known in Old French, and — what is particularly significant — it is found in the *Roman de la Rose*. Thus, — Que vous iroie je disant? I, 28; Que vous iroie ge disant? I, 131; Que vous iroie je notant? I, 45. The third of these passages is the original of one of the lines quoted by Mr. Lounsbury (What shulde I telle you more of it? 1387), though he inadvertently remarks that "there is nothing in the original to authorize this mode of expression in these instances."

IV. *The argument from parallel passages.* — The parallel passage argument is well known to be of extreme flexibility. It can be used to demonstrate imitation, plagiarism, identity of authorship, according to the thesis that one may wish to sustain. It has so often been employed fallaciously that cautious men are apt to eye it with suspicion, even when it is used to support an hypothesis that has no definite arguments against it. When, as in the present case, such definite arguments exist, as we have seen, in overwhelming abundance, only an uncommonly imposing array of parallels can challenge attention. Mr. Lounsbury's lists, indeed, are so extensive, that one's first impulse is to agree with him that they indicate either a Chaucerian authorship for the English *Romaunt* or the *sera vindicta numinis* in letting the plagiarist's version survive.

Unfortunately, before Mr. Lounsbury's lists can be used as evidence they must be reduced by the excision of several groups of passages: (1) unreal or trivial parallelisms, (2) literal translations, (3) idioms, and (4) commonplaces.<sup>1</sup> The boundaries of these groups it is of course impossible to determine accurately; nor, indeed, is that necessary, since a rough classification is sufficient for our purposes. Some of the parallels, as might be expected, are assignable to more groups than one. In the following notes, the number assigned to each parallel by Mr. Lounsbury is retained for convenience,<sup>2</sup> and Roman

<sup>1</sup> See *The Nation*, March 17, 1892, p. 215.

<sup>2</sup> With regard to the four parallels prefixed (without numbers) to the first list, the two on p. 125 are certainly of little account and are admitted by Mr. Lounsbury to be "somewhat remote similarities." In one of them the sole resemblance

numerals are used to indicate whether the example in question is included in his first or in his second list. Thus,—"ii. 59" means "list ii, example no. 59." The order adopted in each note is: first, the *Romaunt* passage; second, the Chaucer passage (in parenthesis); third, the French, if there is any reason for quoting it. The obelus indicates (as in the *Studies*) that the passage in question is not in the original.

1. *Unreal or trivial parallelisms.* Of unreal parallelisms there are at least two interesting examples. These are i. 18 and ii. 59. In i. 18, Ryght as an hunter can abide, 1451, is compared with Right as the hunter in the regne of Trace, *Knt. T.* 781. The resemblance between these lines is slight enough in any case, but the unreality of the parallelism becomes obvious if the two lines be examined each in connection with the context. The *Roman* has:

Et li diex d'Amors m'a seu  
Endementiers en agaitant,  
Com li venieres qui atant  
Que la beste en bel leu se mete  
Por lessier aler la sajete, I, 47.

consists in the use of the adjective *crisp* to describe curly hair. The second is no more striking than a comparison that might be made between *Prol.* 81 (With lokkes crulle, as they were leyd in presse) and *Al.* 4164 (And his lokkes both nought so crolle; cf. *Al.* 1999). The parallel discussed on pp. 123-4 depends simply on the use of *pore estat* to translate *poverté*. This is a phrase, we are told, "not likely to have occurred to two different persons turning [the] line [in question] into English." The phrase, however, is not very extraordinary (see Murray, s.v. *estate*, and add *Townel.* 317). Similar ones occur elsewhere: in fact, *grant estat* is used in the *Roman* itself (I, 164. vv. 5615, 5642). The last of the four is rather an apparent than a real resemblance. The translator, "in a couplet for which there is no authority in the original," describes the rose as "Fresshe, rody, and fayre of hewe, Of coloure ever yliche newe" (3629-30). Chaucer says of the daisy: "She that is of alle floures flour . . . And ever ylyke fair and fresh of hewe, And I love hit, and ever ylyke newe" (*Leg. G. W.* 53-56). In the *Rom.* "ever yliche newe" is an adjective phrase belonging to *coloure*; in the *Legend* the same phrase is adverbial, and modifies *love*. An excellent parallel to this line of the *Legend* is a couplet in *Oct. A.*: And louede well with herte trewe Nyȝt and day ylych newe (91-2). The phrase *ever iliche* is common: thus, — ever aliche newe, *Guy* (A.) 330, 334, *Tars* 367, *Praise of Women* 180; ever aliche grene, *C. A.* 66, I, 85, 202, II, 82, 223, II, 144, 435, III, 352; ever aliche faste, id. 156, I, 322; ever aliche nigh, id. 221, II, 140.



This is translated thus :

The God of Love me folowed aye  
 Ryght as an hunter can abyde  
 The beest, tyl he seeth hys tyde  
 To shoten, at goodnesse, to the dere,  
 When that hym nedeth go no nere, 1450 ff.

It is difficult to see what this has in common with the famous simile of the Thracian hunter in *The Knight's Tale* :

Tho chaungen gan the colour in his face ;  
 Right as the hunter in the regne of Trace  
 That stondeth at the gappe with a spere,  
 Whan hunted is the leoun or the bere, 780 ff., —

a simile well known to have been borrowed by Chaucer from Boccaccio's *Teseide*, vii, 106 :

E ciaschedun per sè divenne tale  
 Qual ne' getuli boschi il cacciatore  
 A' rotti balzi accostatosi, il quale  
 Il leon mosso per lungo romore  
 Aspetta,

and by Boccaccio from Statius, *Theb.* iv, 494 ff.

ii. 59† is even more remarkable an instance of unreal parallelism. "A fooles belle is soone runge," 5268, is merely synonymous with the proverbial "A fool's bolt is soon shot,"<sup>1</sup> and is therefore no fit companion-piece for "Thorghout the world my belle shal be ronge,"<sup>2</sup> *Troil.* v, 1062, — words in which Cressid expresses the desperate conviction that her infidelity to Troilus will be proclaimed over the whole earth, as it were by the bellman or town-crier.

Parallels of a somewhat trivial sort are ii. 3 and i. 37. In ii. 3

<sup>1</sup> "Sottes bolt is sone shote," *Proverbs of Hendyng*, 85: see Hazlitt, *English Proverbs and Proverbial Phrases*, 1869, pp. 11-12, Skeat, *Chaucer, the Minor Poems*, p. 305, and add "Fole bolt es sone shot," *Ywain and Gawain*, 2168 (where see Schleich), "You know a fooles boult is soone shot," Armin, *Nest of Ninnies*, 1608, Shakesp. Soc. ed., p. 15. Cf. "Wimmannes bolt is sone schote," *Beves* 1192.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. She thought she wold rynge her bell, *Par.* 5482; How Perse after his false tonge Hath so thenvious belle ronge, etc., *C. A.* 119, I, 217; And eke so loude his belle is ronge, id. 146, I, 294; Come forth, Avaunter, nowe I rynge thy belle, *Court of Love*, 1219.

Hym luste not to playe, 344, is compared with Me luste not pleye, *Troil.* v, 987, and similar phrases. But here the French is *Il ne li tenoit d'envoisier*, I, 12, and *pleye* for *sport, enjoy oneself*, etc., was one of the commonest of fourteenth-century words. In i. 37, Gode men of religioun, 6197, is compared with A good man was ther of religioun, *Prol.* 477. *Man of religioun* is no unusual compound (see, e.g., *Mel.* 767, 1590). The parallel is thereby reduced to the adjective *good*. In the case of i. 3, it will strike no one as peculiar that *termes* and *domes* (which was then as common among lawyers as *judgment* is now) should be used by two independent writers when speaking of men of law, especially when *termes* is perhaps used in different senses in the two passages quoted. In ii. 18, the parallel between the phrase *the sote grene gras* on the one hand and the phrases *the softe and swote grene gras* and *the smale softe swote gras* on the other hand is anything but noteworthy. In ii. 49 the parallel between But fledde away for verrey drede, 3860, and He fledde away for verray sorwe and shame, *C. Y. Prol.* 149, is similarly slender.

Parallels of an utterly trivial character are i. 4 (*these olde folk* being the only similar phrase), i. 7 (For merye and wel-bigoon was she: So was I glad and wel-begon), i. 8 (To here The briddes how they syngen clere: Herkneth thise blisful briddes how they singe), i. 13 (Blak as a bery: Brown as is a berye), i. 26 (fals suspeciou), i. 30 (The tour was rounde maad in compas: Round was the shap in manere of compas), i. 32 (Snybbe bittirly: snibben sharply), i. 46 (Crie and rore = Fr. uler, II, 34: a roryng and a cry; cf. I cry and rore, *Townel.* 149), i. 48 (Sothly, what so men hym calle: Sooth to seyn, I not how men hym calle), ii. 45 (The estres of the swote place: The estres of the grisly place), ii. 65 (God so wys be my socour = Si m'aïst Diex et sains Jaques, II, 14: God so wys be my savacioun).

Almost as insignificant is i. 20,—And diede withynne a lytel space, 1536: And deyed within the thridde morwe, *B. Duch.* 214, where there is certainly no striking similarity in any point of *peculiar* phraseology, and where, for the fact of death the original (Et fu mors en poi de termine, I, 50) is surely sufficient authority. *Within a little space* is by no means a strange phrase (see, for example, *Generydes* 435, 1055), and the idea of sudden death is not foreign to the romances (cf., as specimens, Or else be ded within a throw,

*Yw.* 2412; Ther was slawe and brougt to grounde Mani man in litel stounde, *A. and M.* 451-52; That withinne a litel stound Thei felden mani on to grounde, *Ot. B.* 923-24. Nor is *er the thridde morwe* unexampled (A siknesse er the thridde morwe Conceived hath of dedly sorwe, *C. A.* 132, I, 250).

Another striking instance of trivial parallelism is i. 33, *fals traitour*, 4548, 6073, 6310, *Knt. T.* 722, *Reeve's T.* 349. But this comparison may be attacked on other grounds. *A fals traitour than shulde I be* in 4548 merely translates *Traîtres faus honnis seroie*, I, 137.<sup>1</sup> And besides the phrase *fals traitour* is common enough in the romances (see, for example, *Rich.* 3230, *Bev. B.* 2650, *Guy* (Univ.) 9649, *Ath.* 139, *Par.* 2591, 3536, 4417, *Gen.* 2346; cf. False and disceyuable traitour, *Guy* (Cajus) 2075; the falseste traytoure, *Mel.* 173; a traytour fals and felle, *Par.* 3122; traitour, fals man, *Amis* 848; fals tresoun, *Par.* 3970). — Similarly without force as evidence is (ii. 72) the resemblance between That false traytoursse untrewre, 7392, and The false trayteresse perverse, *B. Duch.* 413, though both lines refer to Fortune.

2. *Literal translations.*—We must next cut out of Mr. Lounsbury's lists all passages in which the translator has merely rendered his original literally in English words inevitably obvious to his recollection, or in which at least the phrase that makes the parallel is thus literally translated. Some of the parallels here discussed might also be included in the categories of "trivial," "idiomatic," or "common-place."

i. 1. Now this dreame wol I ryme aright, 31. (To tellen al my dreem aright, *Hous F.* 527.) Or veil cel songe rimaier, I, 2.—The only real parallel, then, consists in the use by Chaucer and by the translator of *aright*. How common that adverb is need not be insisted on: cf. That y no may telle it aright, *A. and M.* 9108; Arede my sweven aright, *C. A.* 387, III, 216. The parallelism between the latter passage and Now God, quod he, my swevene rede aright, *N. Pr. T.* 76, is much closer than Mr. Lounsbury's.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The phrase *fals traitour* in 6073 represents *maus traïstres* (II, 1); in 6310, *traïstre* without epithet (II, 9).

<sup>2</sup> And so, perhaps, the parallel between But *undoth* us the avysoun, *R. R.* 9, and Was none his sweven couth undo, *C. A.* 87, I, 138.

i. 2. To make your hertes gaye and lyght, 32. (That made hire herte fresshe and gay, *Troil.* ii, 922; Make his herte light, id. v, 684; Wolde han makid any herte light, *Frankl. T.* 186; It made alle her hertes for to lighte, *Sq. T.* 388.) Por vos cuers plus fere esgaier, I, 2. Surely this is sufficiently literal. The translator has merely filled out his verse with the adjective *light*, very common in double phrases, as some of the following examples will show, while others illustrate other points in Mr. Lounsbury's parallel. Cf. A thing that maketh mine heart light, *Rich.* 1908; In herte he was glad and lyght, id. 4862, *Bev.* 4524; In hert y was glad and liȝt, *Guy* (A.) 4640; With herte good and liȝt, *Lib.* 167; His herte was good and liȝt, id. 170; Tho was the kyng yn herte lyȝt, *Oct. A.* 1007; Than in hert sho was ful lyght, *Yw.* 3962; In hir hert sho was ful light, id. 3375; His hert to liȝt, *Wil.* 10; Than waxe thayre hertes lyȝte, *Fer.* 5505; For he made him blithe and lyght, *Al.* 6934; It made me bath joyful and lyght, *Yw.* 366; They made hem fressh and gay, *Ber.* 234; Ne so light ne so glad, *Ip. B.* 307; Were glad and lyght, *Guy* (Caius) 8721; Trapped full fresch and gay, *Par.* 6368, cf. 1817, 1905-6; Thow I be not fressh and gay, id. 6404; Embrowdyd wyth gold both fressh and gay, id. 6458.

i. 5. The translator uses *a rose garland* (566) to render *un chapel de roses* (I, 19), whereupon Mr. Lounsbury quotes two cases in which Chaucer mentions a rose garland.

i. 6. And she hadde on a cote of grene, 573. (And he was clad in cote and hood of grene, *Prol.* 103.) Cote ot d'un riche vert, I, 19.

i. 9. I shalle By ordre tellen you it alle, 711-12. (By ordre telle, Ch.) Tout vous conteré par ordre, I, 23.

i. 10. They were lyk . . . To angels that ben fethered brighte, 741-2. (The pekok with his angels fethers bright, *Parl. F.* 356.) Car il sembloient Tout por voir anges empennés, I, 24.

i. 11. Wel coude she synge and lustyly, 747. (How that they singen wel and merily, *N. Pr. T.* 452.) Bien sot chanter et plesamment, I, 24. The parallel is besides of a trivial character. The fowlys song merely and swette, *Ipom. A.* 7226, is as good a companion-piece to the line from the *N. Pr. T.*, and so, for that matter, is almost any one of the innumerable places in which the romances mention the singing of birds.



i. 12. The shape, the bodies, and the cheres, The countenance and the maneres, 813-14. (The shap, the countenance, and the figures, *Knt. T.* 1058.) Les cors, les façons, et les chieres, Les semblances et les manieres, I, 26.

i. 17. Hir nose was gentyl and tretys, 1216. (Hir nose tretys, *Prol.* 152.) Et si n'ot pas nes d'Orlenois, Ainçois l'avait lonc et traitis, I, 39-40. — *Traitis* is a common epithet for an elegantly shaped nose in Old French (see, e.g., *Richars li Biaus*, 149, *Chev. as deus Espees*, 4301, 12204, *Meraugis de Portlesguez*, ed. Michelant, p. 5); and it was in use in English long before the date of the *Prologue*, cf. *nose tretus* in the poem entitled *In Praise of Women*, printed by Laing, *Peni Worth of Witte*, etc., from the Auchinleck MS., v. 43.

i. 23. Thanne adventures shulle thee falle, 2389. (Of adventures that whylom han befallé, *Prol.* 795.) Lors t'avendront les aventures, I, 75. — The expression is typical in the romances and elsewhere. Thus, — Of adventures that han befallé, *Orfeo* 21; The aventure that was befallé, *Fer.* 4576; To whom his aventure plein He tolde, of that is him befallé, *C. A.* 69, I, 92; Of wofull auntres that befelle, id. 287, II, 324; Of adventures that fillen, *Orfeo* 15; Of old auentours that fel while, *Freine* 8; Now of this auentours that weren yfalle, id. 19; Soche aventure felle in that lande, *Oct. B.* 212; What aventure that you felle, *C. A.* 91, I, 148.

i. 35. For soth it is, whom it displese, 5702. (I not to whom it mighte displese, *N. Pr. T.* 440.) Et si n'est voirs, cui qu'il displese, I, 169.

i. 36. They neither love God ne drede, 5776. (I so love and drede, *Leg.* 211; I most drede and love, *Frankl. T.* 584.) Certes Dieu n'aiment ne ne doutent, I, 170. — Cf. To every lifyng wight That wold luf hym an dred, *Townel.* 21; for luf ne drede, *Yw.* 2289, *Par.* 7169; for drede ne for love, *C. A.* 88, I, 140; in grete drede and loue, *A. and M.* 717; with loue or eyȝe, *Bev.* 1852; with love ne eye, *Rich.* 602; Some for Gamelynes loue and some for his eyȝe, *Gam.* 129, cf. 543; And of drede and luf of God almyghty, *Pr. Cons.* 142; Til mekenes and til lufe and drede, id. 158; What for loue what for ay, *A. and M.* 255.

i. 44. Such folk drinken gret misese, 6809. (Our wreche is this oure owen wo to drynke, *Tr.* ii, 784; Men drynken ofte peyne and

gret distresse, *Troil.* iii, 1216.) Tex gens boivent trop de mesaise, II, 27. The passages from *Troil.* (to which might have been added, — Withoutte cuppe he drank al his penaunce, *Frankl.* 214) indicate, at most, no more than that Chaucer derived this figure of *drinking distresse* from the *Roman* or from the French; and even this they by no means prove (cf. such phrases as, — Ther hi habbeth dronke bittre then the galle, *Bödd.* p. 119; Let him habbe, ase he brew, bale to dryng, id. p. 99; And thus of that they brewe soure I drinke swete, *C. A.* 99, I, 167-8; And who so wicked ale [cf. O. N. meinblandinn mjǫðr] breweth, Full ofte he mot the worse drinke, id. 161, I, 334; And than I drinke a bitter swete With drie lippe and eyen wete, id. 316, III, 9-10; I am drunke of that I drinke Of these thoughtes that I thinke, id. 316, III, 11; and perhaps, Thus drinke I in min owne swot, id. 68, I, 89).

i. 41. I entermete not of her fare, 6500. (I hate of thee thy nice fare! Why entremete of that thou ne hast to don? *Troil.* i, 1025.) Ne m'entremete de lor affaire, II, 17. — Cf. De ce ne moi doi entremetre, II, 21, = I wole not entremete a dele, 6637; Dorste entermete of eni such thing, *Flor.* 606; Entermetyd of this dome, *Al.* 4025, etc.

i. 45. Maken thurgh oure golet glide, 7048. (That may go thurgh the golet softe and swote, *Pard. T.* 81.) Dont par les geules nous frapons, II, 34.

i. 49. And skath is, 7567. (That was scathe, *ProL.* 446.) Si r'est damages, II, 50. — Same idiom in *Yw.* 1859; *Guy* (A.) 1542; *Rich.* 5002, 5009; *Bev.* 522; *A. and M.* 7512; *Havel.* 2006; *Gam.* 488; cf. *Ip. A.* 7877.

But cases of this kind are not confined to List I. They occur as well in List II, which Mr. Lounsbury regards as of prime importance.

ii. 1. Wel coude he peynte, I undertake, 174. (Wel couthe he peynten lyfly that it wroghte, *Knt. T.* 1229.) Moult sot bien paindre, I, 6.

ii. 5. Ne of hir answer daungerous, 591. (Ne of his speche daungerous, *ProL.* 517.) Ne de respondre desdaigneuse, I, 19. *Daungerous* was a common word for *disdainful*. (Cf. *Roman*, I, 301.)

ii. 7. I may not telle you al at ones, 710. (I may not al at ones speke in ryme, *Leg.* 102; I may not telle you as now, *B. Duch.* 216.)

Tout ensemble dire ne puis, I, 23. — Cf. also, — That tellen alle y no can, *A. and M.* 5040; No al siggen y no may, id. 1433; Y no may telle al, *Al.* 4499; That ich ne can the noumbre telle, *Guy* (A.) 3609; The nomber can i nouȝt telle in tale, *Bev.* 1902; No conne we nought telle in tale, *Al.* 2932; I may nought tel the ioy thai had, *Yw.* 2493.

ii. 19. And floures yelowē, white, and rede, 1433. (Fresshe floures blew and white and rede, *Troil.* ii, 51; Floures white, blewe, and yelwe and rede, *Parl. F.* 186.) Flors i ot blanches et vermeilles, De trop jaunes en i ot merveilles, I, 46. — Cf., also, *Rich.* 2644, *Ber.* 696, 2764.

ii. 21. Therfore God held it ferme and stable, 1500; But if he be so ferme and stable, 5226. (I holde it ferme and stable, *Merch. T.*, 255; Al your pleasaunce ferme and stable I holde, *Cl. T.* 608.) Et por ce la fist Diex estable, I, 49; S'il n'est si fers et si estables, I, 158. — Cf. That his pite be ferme and stable, *C. A.* 380, III, 198; make it ferme and stabylle, *Townel.* 193; Men makes it trew and stabil, *Yw.* 37.

ii. 26. My lyf, my deth is in youre honde, 1955 (similarly 4596). (My lyf, my deth hool in thin honde I leye, *Troil.* i, 1053.) Car ma vie est en vostre main, I, 62. — Cf. My lyfe my deth lyeth all in yow, *Par.* 6312.

ii. 27. I wol ben hool at youre devis, 1974. (We wol reuled ben at his devis, *Prol.* 816.) Que metre veil tout a devise, I, 62. Cf. avoir amie a son devis, I, 43, translated To have a love at his devis, 1326. — Mätzner gives examples of *at . . . deuys* from Langtoft, p. 167, *Cursor M.* 11574; he also quotes *after his deuys*, *Kindh. Jesu*, 1385; Lokes that ye doo be my devys, *Rich.* 1440. Add, — Kyng Richard at his devys, *Rich.* 3803; And hath yrad the at oure deuys, *Fer.* 4083; Hit semed better at my devyse, *Par.* 5737; That (*l.* Than) was that ship at my devyse, id. 6105; Atte hir pleasur and atte hir owyn devise, In that castell she tared for to rest, *Gen.* 1286-7; Adam . . . hath (for *have*) wrought Lyke to myn ymage, att my devyse, *Townel.* 72. In *Bödd.* p. 140, *at mi deuys* = in my will, testament.

ii. 33. Holde thee wel apayed, 2891; holde you paid full well, 6035. (Thus held hem ech . . . wel apayed, *Troil.* iii, 421; chit and halt him yvel apayed, *C. Y. Prol.* 368.) Et t'en tendras a bien

païé, I, 88; Que vous en tendrés a païés, I, 363. — The idiom *to holde . . . well* (*yvel*) (*a*)*paid* is very common: see *Yw.* 1228, 1232, 1246; *Bev. B.* 144, 2079; *Fer.* 271, 4025; *C. A.* 257, II, 239; *Par.* 1360, 5269; and cf. I holde me nought fully paid, *C. A.* 152, I, 310; I hold me paide, *Townel.* 13, 252; war thai wele paid, *Yw.* 1335; he was wele payd, *Yw.* 2628; he was fulle evylle payde, *Tryam.* 126.

ii. 34. Now have I declared thee alle oute, 2935. (Now have I yow declared, *Sec. N. T.* 119; Now sith I have declared yow, *Pars. T.*, Gilman, II, 138.) Or t'ai, ce m'est vis, desclaré, I, 89. — Cf. He tolde hem and declareth out, *C. A.* 429, III, 337.

ii. 36. Skil [= reason] ne (and, nor) right, 3120, 4543, 5305, translates *droiture* (I, 95), *droit* (I, 137), *droit et raison* (I, 160). The cases of *skil* and *right* quoted from Ch. (*Leg.* 1392, *M. of L.* 610) are, therefore, not particularly significant, especially in view of such expressions as, — To wyrke after ryght and skylle, *Rich.* 1446; Than schuld y thurch skil and riȝt Hate the euer more, *Guy* (A.) st. 82, p. 446; wyth reson and with right, *Townel.* 72.

ii. 62. Barouns, take heede of my sentence, 6141. (Foules, take hede of my sentence, *Parl. F.* 383.) Barons, entendés ma sentence, II, 4.

ii. 64. Thou shalt not streyne me a del, 6408. (If his witing streyneth nevere a del, *N. Pr. T.* 429.) Vous ne m'en poés pas contraindre, II, 13.

ii. 66. For I am out of thi grucching, 6441. (For we ben out of here correccioun, *Fr. T.* 31.) Car hors sui de vostre dangier, II, 15.

ii. 67. Han of his myscheef soome pitee, 6733. (O haveth of my deth pitee, *Hous F.* 325.) En doivent lors avoir pitié, II, 24. — Cf. Of tham sir Ywayn had grete pete, *Yw.* 237; Kyng Richard theroff hadde pyte, *Rich.* 5912; Grete pite he hath of that kniȝt, *Guy* (A.) 4684; God of him haue pite, id. 5776; Of therl he hadde gret pite, id. 6980; That folk hadde therof pite miche, id. 7114; Gye had pyte of his mornynge, *Guy* (Caius) 7594; Reinbroun hadde of him pite, *Reinb.* 65; Of his deth they had grete pytee, *Par.* 1099.

ii. 70. To wynnenn is alwey myn entente, 6839. (Myn entente is nat but for to wyne, *Parl. Prol.* 117.) En aquerre est toute m'entente, II, 28. *Winnen* is the ordinary word for *gain*, *acquire*: cf. Onely for they wolde winne, *C. A.* 39, I, 17.

ii. 71. For it is wonder longe to here, 7210. (It were a longe



thyng for to here, *Troil.* iii, 495 ; If it were to long to here, *Knt. T.* 17.) Mes or ne vous en voil plus dire Que trop i a longue matire, II, 19, is the passage which the translator renders by But I wole stynt of this matere For it is wonder long to here. To multiply examples of the Middle English "longum est" "in rebus apertissimis nimis longi sumus" is unnecessary. That the form here used is not an unnatural one for two persons to fall into may be inferred from It were a glad thing for to here, *C. A.* 416, III, 301. Cf. No ich it nouȝt telle no miȝt For long dueling, *Guy* (A.) 961-2 ; What helpeth it make tale long? *A. and M.* 3055. (See p. 24.)

3 and 4. It is obvious that before Mr. Lounsbury's lists can be used as evidence, we must draw our pens through those of his numbers in which the parallelism consists in the use (1) of an idiom which anybody might have employed or (2) of a literary commonplace. Since it is impossible to distinguish in all cases between these two categories, they are here considered together. In the same division are included a number of passages which, if not strictly either idioms or commonplaces, are destitute of all demonstrative force because they can be shown to occur in one or more writers that precede Chaucer, as well as a few miscellaneous matters put here to avoid an unpractically minute classification.

i. 2. In worlde nys wyght so harde of herte That hadde sene hir sorowes smerte That nolde have had of her pytye, 333-5. (In this world there nys so hard an herte, That nolde have rewed on hire peynes smerte, *Troil.* iv, 1140-41 ; In al this world ther nys so cruel herte, That hire hadde herd compleynen in hire sorwe, That nold han wopen for hire peynes smerte, *id.*, v, 722-4.) Nus, tant fust durs, ne la veist, A cui grant pitié n'en preist, I, 11. The striking nature of the parallels becomes less striking when we remember that *hard of herte* would be the most obvious fourteenth-century, as *hard-hearted* would be the ordinary modern, translation of *durs* in the French passage,<sup>1</sup> that *sorwes* (*peynes*) *smerte* is one of the commonest of fourteenth-century expressions, and that *herte* and *smerte* are rhymes of the inevitable sort which Pope laughed at in *The Essay on Criticism*.

---

<sup>1</sup> A school French dictionary in common use in this country renders *un père dur* by a *hard-hearted father*.

i. 14. As whyte as lylle or rose in rys, 1015. (As whit as is the blomse upon the rys, *Mil. T.* 138.) The original (I, 33) has: blanche comme flor de lis. The comparison of a lady's complexion to the lily, or to the rose, or to lilies and roses, is sufficiently familiar. Thus,—Flors de lis et rose nouele Quant ele pert u tans d'esté Trespassoit ele de biauté, *Lai de Lanval*, 94-96, etc., etc. Neither is the addition of *on rys* anything extraordinary: cf., e.g., Roddy as rose in rise, *Lib.* 1322; As rose on rys her rode was red, *Chestre* 937; Hire rode is ase rose that red is on rys, With lilye-white leres lossum he is, *Bödd.* p. 145; Lylie whyt hue (= she) is, Hire rode so rose on rys, *id.* p. 150. The only curious thing about the translation is that the author uses the rose as an emblem of whiteness, and this Chaucer does *not* do in the passage quoted (with which compare, for example: Sche was whyte os blossome on flowre, *Tryam.* 628).

i. 15, 16. In world is noon so faire a wight, 1029. (In this world was noon so fair on lyve, *Manc. T.* 18.) So faire trow I was never noon, 1110. (A fairer sey I never noon than she, *Cl. T.* 977.) Though the first of these passages merely translates Qu'il n'ot si bele fame ou monde, I, 33, it seems best to take up the two together, since the second is not found in the French and since they are so very similar. The phrases are in the highest degree typical, as the following examples will show (cf. also ii. 13, 16). Nis in this world so faire a qwene, *Al.* 7588; In the world may non feirer be, *Guy* (A.) 4666; In all this world was non so fayre, *Ip. A.* 38; In all the world so faire was none, *C. A.* 304, II, 376; On erthe fayrer was neuer non, *Launf.* (R.) 423; Was non so fayr under god That euere yete in erthe were, *Havel.* 972-3; So good a knyght as he me semyth non In all the world, *Gen.* 2427; Men wist in thilke time none So fair a wight as she was one, *C. A.* 199, II, 70; In all the lond . . . Men wisten none so faire as she, *id.* 157, I, 324; In all this land, bothe ferre and nere, Ys none so feyre a bachelere, *Ip. B.* 691-2; Fairer ne miȝte non beo born, *Horn* 10; In this world thenne wer there No beter knyghtes thenne they were, *Rich.* 4989-90; In world y were no better kniȝt, *Guy* (A.) 2908; In the world ne worth man of so gret miȝt, *id.* 4263, cf. 2913, 3122, st. 279; In this world (all the worlde C.) is better non (noo better C.), *Guy* (A.) 6120; Ne saȝ i neure my lyue So fair kniȝt alyue, *Horn* 777-8; A fairer child

neuer i ne siz, *Bev.* 536 ; A fayrer knyghte was neuer sene, *Ot.* 1199 ; A ffeyrer child was nevure none bore, *Bev. B.* 69 ; Fayrer women neuer he see, *Launf.* (R.) 61 ; Sye he never so ffeire a place, id. 1156 ; In al Ingland ther nas non A fairer maiden than hye was on, *Freine* 233-4 ; So strong so fair never non nas That he no passith with allas, *Al.* 7835-6 ; A foulere thing nas neuer non, *Bev.* 2678 ; So foule yet sigh he neuer none, *C. A.* 70, I, 93, cf. *Guy* (A.) 5829, 7170 ; Richer saw I (he) never nane, *Yw.* 362, 752 ; Gretter saw he never nane, id. 2238 ; So strong a knyght sawe y never none, *Tryam.* 1337. — The great frequency of similar hyperbolical phrases in Old French (onques plus bele ne fu, que onques mais si bele ne vit, ainc tant bel ne fu veue, onques tant bele ne vi, etc.) should not be lost sight of. Examples may be seen in Grosse, *Der Stil Crestien's von Troies*, *Franz. Stud.*, I, 184 ff., Boerner, *Raoul de Houdenc*, pp. 55 ff., Heinrich, *Ueber den Stil von Guillaume de Lorris und Jean de Meung*, *Ausg. u. Abhandl.*, XXIX, 35, Binet, *Le Style de la Lyrique Courtoise*, p. 65.

i. 19. Hym loved over any creature, 1475. (She him trusted over any creature, *Anel. & Arc.* 91.) L'avoit amé plus que riens née, I, 48. — Cf. Iosyan Beues can love, Ouer all erthly thinge above, *Bev. B.* 454 ; Love me above alle erthly thing, *Par.* 2901 ; Aboue any erthly creature, id. 124 ; Above all erthly creatures, *C. A.* 358, III, 135 ; Over alle men y the desyre, *Al.* 6689.

i. 21. The sole parallelism consists in the use of *gret wone* by the translator (1673) to render *grans monciaus* (I, 54) and in Chaucer's employment of the same phrase in the same sense (i.e. great abundance, great plenty). *Good won* in this meaning is extremely common (see *Yw.* 1429, 1665, 1685, 3571 ; *Havel.* 1024, 1791, 1837, 1907, 2325, 2617, 2729<sup>1</sup> ; *Ip. A.* 7679 ; *Guy* (A.) 2588 ; *Reinb.* sts. 49, 51 ; *Oct. A.* 1641 ; *Chestre* 360 ; *Fer.* 3571, 4465, 5517 ; *Sowd.* 2093 ; *Gam.* 125 ; *Isumbr.* 401 ; *Ot.* 1408 ; *P. Pl. B.* xx, 170 = C. xxiii, 171, where see Skeat) ; so, *much wone* (*Al.* 1468), *so mekyl wonne: to done* (*Rich.* 5125) ; *beter won* (*Rich.* 3548) ; see also Zupiza on *Guy* (Univers.) 10329-32. But *grete wone* is also far from unusual : thus, — He broght folk ful grete wone, *Laur. Minot*, iii, 163 ; Thai fand the galay men grete wane, id. 93 ; Of

<sup>1</sup> In several of the *Havelok* passages the phrase is used adverbially.



god corn gret won, *Rob. Gl.* p. 2; Richard gaff gyftes grete wones, *Rich.* 3747; Grete woone Of horse of golde of rychesse, *Par.* 1378-9; Of gold swith gret won, *Alis. fragm.* 546 (*Skeat, Wil. of Pal.*, etc., p. 194).

i. 22†. Woundes large and wide, 1899. (Large woundes wide, wyde woundes, bloody woundes wyde and sore, bloody woundes deep and wyde, woundes . . . deep and wyde.) Cf. woundes large and wyde, *Bev. B.* 594; a grete wound and a wyde, *Guy* (A.) 10667; woundes wyde, *Lib.* 1176, *Ot.* 1175, *Sowd.* 1472, *Gen.* 2475; woundes wete and wyde, *Ot.* 1462,—and, one might almost add, every romance passage where wounds are mentioned at all. Cf. also, Hise wondir wondis depe and wide, *Pol. Rel. and Love P.*, p. 235.

i. 24. That faire fresshe whan thou maist see, 2461. (Faire freshe May, *Merch.* 638, 711.) Cf. the same coupling of the same adjectives in *C. A.* 54, 83, 291, 416 (I, 53, 125, II, 333, III, 301); *Beryn* 2347; *Par.* 5933, 6490. Further examples are unnecessary.

i. 27†. Every other Shalle helpen as his owne brother, 2883-4. (Everich of hem heelp for to armen other, As frendly as he were his owne brother, *Knt. T.* 793.) An almost inevitable rhyme.<sup>1</sup> Cf. And eche of hem assureth other To helpe as to his owne brother, *C. A.* 162, I, 339; And loke that ichon held with other, As ich man schal with his brother, *A. and M.* 3047-8; Echone to sette pees with other And loven as his owne brother, *C. A.* 47, I, 39; Clippe and kusse eyther other As either hedde been otheres brother, *Ot. B.* 605-6.

i. 28†. The game goth alle amys, 3927. (If . . . the game wente aright, *Mil. T.* 219; The game is wel bigonne, *Mil. Prol.* 9.) If the second of these passages from Chaucer is a fair parallel, any figurative use of *game* may be adduced, for *bigonne* is the correct reading and not an error for *begon*. Cf. How the gamen zede, *Langt.* p. 67 (Mätz.) ; How so that the game goth, *C. A.* 143, I, 280; How so the gam gose, *Townel.* 109; Ful grevously bigan that gamyn, *Yw.* 3531; Then wer our game fayr bigunne, *Rich.* 5152; That game was evel bygonnen, *Sowd.* 3141; This game ys begonne wele, *Par.* 7016; Anone is all the game shent, *C. A.* 223, II, 143; And thus was all the game shent, *id.* 272, II, 281. With the last two quota-

<sup>1</sup> As, *Ot. B.* 730-1, 901-2, 1097-8; *Pol. and Vern.* 68-9.



tions from Gower, cf. Ek yn some lond were al the game shent, *Troil.* ii, 38.

i. 29. At myscheef, 3998. (At meschief, *Knt. T.* 1693.) See the same phrase in *C. A.* 170, I, 359, *Isumbr.* 562, *Wil. of Pal.* 1362, *Tryam.* 875, *Par.* 6800, Wyntown ann. 1335; yn myschef, *Chestre* 423, *Wil. of Pal.* 5131; Helpe me now at my myschefe, *Tryam.* 437.

i. 31. In awayte lyth, 4497. (In awayt ligen, *N. Pr. T.* 405.) See Murray, s.v. *await*. Of course the idiom was common: cf. *C. A.* 136, 297 (I, 260, II, 355).

i. 38. Heere I turne agayne, 6298. (I wol turne again, Now wol I torne agayn, Torne we agayn, Ch.) Formula in transition. Very common. Examples are,—Torne we aȝe(n), *Fer.* 1104, 1509, 1653, 2818 (cf. 2139), *Bev.* 1263, *Bev. B.* 1039, *Gen.* 758, 2116, 2410; Ipomadon leve we thus And turne agayne to Cabanus, *Ip. A.* 8201-2; Turne we now, *Ip. B.* 1955; Now lete we be the werre . . . And turne aȝen to fayre Floraunce, *Oct. A.* 1549-51; Now reste we her and turne agayn, *Oct. B.* 1777; Torne ayein to Philomene, *C. A.* 285, II, 319; Torne we therto ayeine, id. 412, III, 292; To Tīre I thenke torne ayein, id. 425, III, 327; To Charls now will I torne agayne, *Mel.* 876; Agayne to hym will I retorne, *Ip. A.* 1047; I woll retourne ageyn to the company, *Ber.* 129; Now leve I the pardonere . . . And woll retourne me ageyn riȝt ther as I did leue, *Ber.* 378; Now to the sowdon lete us turne ageyn, *Gen.* 2563; To this lady lete vs turne ageyn, id. 225; To Generydes I will returne, id. 569. *Wende oȝain* is similarly used: see *Guy* (A.) 4819, *A. and M.* 5348.

i. 39. But therof geve I lytel tale, 6378. (Litel tale hath he told, *N. Pr. T.* 298.) Mes ne me chaut comment qu'il aille, I, 12. Cf. Ef scho gif of him no tale, *Metr. Homilies* (Small), p. 123; Thei gaf no tale of wham, R. Mannyng, ed. Hearne, p. 220; geue y no tale, *Guy* (Univ.) 8143; That noither of thee ne of Pore Ne helden tale, *Al.* 5616-17; Of other heuene than here holde thei no tale, *P. Pl. B.* i, 9; Of no man no held he tale, *A. and M.* 5466; He no tellith no tale therof, id. 6987; makith no tale, *Al.* 7007; maketh litel tale, *P. Pl. C.* iv, 394; Thou tellest so litel of me, *Fer.* 404; Lyte men of hym tolde, *Chestre* 189; He gave butt litill fors, *Gen.* 2268. (Four or five references are taken from Zupitza's note on *Guy* (Univ.) 8143.)

i. 40. I yeve not of her harme a bene, 6466. (They yeven noght a leek For no fame, *Hous F.* 1708.) Tharof ne ȝef he nouȝt a bene, *Bev.* 744; Of all that in the world were Ne yave I not an here, *Guy* (Caius) 8315-16; He ne ȝaf a note of his othes, *Havel.* 419; Of hem ne yeue ich nouht a slo, id. 2051; Therof ȝiue y nouȝt a slo, *Am.* 395; <sup>1</sup> Of my lyfe ȝeve y not a slo, *Orfeo* 340 (MS. H); He ȝaue a nedel of his fon, *A. and M.* 4012; <sup>2</sup> Therof ȝiue y nouȝt a chirston, *Guy* (A.) st. 203; <sup>3</sup> No ȝaf he ther of nouȝt a ferne, *A. and M.* 8866; Theroffe yaf he nouth a stra, *Havel.* 466 = 315; <sup>4</sup> Off the lyoun ne geve I nought, *Rich.* 1027; Of the dethe geue y noght, *Guy* (Univ.) 4459, cf. 7691, 9144, *Guy* (A.) 241, *St. Cristopher* 180; Thei ne gyueȝt nouȝte of God one gose wyng, *P. Pl.* B. iv, 36; Of alle thine mitte ne yeued ho word ati (?) hawe, *St. Marherete* (Cockaigne) p. 36; For thy lyff and thy barouns He wyl not geve two skalouns, *Rich.* 6833-34; <sup>5</sup> For Dames . . . I nolde haue ȝeue a botoun, *Bev.* 1610; <sup>6</sup> For kyng Rychard and his galyes We wolde nought gyve two flyes, *Rich.* 2501-2; <sup>7</sup> He nolde geve a pynne, *Al.* 6146; Y nolde noȝt ȝyue a myte, *Fer.* 1579. — At this point we may conveniently consider the correspondence which Mr. Lounsbury observes between Chaucer and the translator in the matter of disparaging comparisons. "The translator," he says, "evinces a taste for the employment of *mite*, *leek*, and *bean*, which happen also to be favorite comparisons of Chaucer himself" (II, 137). In a note, we are informed that *leek* appears three times in this use in the *Romaunt*, *bean* once, and *mite* twice, — none of them, surely, a surprising number of times. And all these comparisons occur elsewhere. Thus (besides the cases cited above): Neuer to weld of worldes merthe the worth of a mite, *Wil.*

<sup>1</sup> For *slo* in depreciatory phrases see *Guy* (A.) 1413, 2936, 3638, *Oct. A.* 975, *Havel.* 849, *Fer.* 4338.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. I sete not an nedylle, *Townel.* 104; not worthe a neld, id. 11 (where the Surtees Soc. ed. prints *an eld*).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. They sett all othur of worthynes But at a chery stone, *Ip. A.* 3439-40.

<sup>4</sup> For *stra*, *stre* see *Yw.* 2655, *Lib.* 449, *Fer.* 2229.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. He seyde hy ner worth a scaloun, *Oct. A.* 1313. *Scaloun* is explained by Sarrazin ad l. as meaning *shilling*. The word is, of course, the modern English *scallion*, O. Fr. *escalone* (cf. Primer, *Dialect Notes*, Amer. Dial. Soc., pt. II, 1890, p. 59).

<sup>6</sup> Cf. *Guy* (A.) 2216.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. *Fer.* 5840, *Par.* 1422.

2017; I wold nowt wilne a mite worth, id. 4736; half a mite, id. 5348; not worth a lek, *Oct. A.* 1205, *Sowd.* 1726, *Piers of Fulham* (Hartshorne, p. 118); nocht worth ane leik, Lyndesay's *Three Estais*, 564, E. E. T. S., p. 396; nouȝt worth a lekes clof, *Guy* (A.) 3644; not worthe oone leke, *Townel.* 14; A leke what rekes us? id. 4; not worthe a bene, *Ip. A.* 6238; Alle is not worthe a beyn, *Townel.* 229; They be not worth a bene, *Court of Love* 796; I ne bidde nouȝt a bene worth, *Wil.* 4754. It should be further noticed that words for leek and garlic are common in Old French in this use and not unknown in Italian, and that *vaillant un ail*, *vaillant une cive*, and *ne me vaut une cive* occur in the *Roman de la Rose* (I, 72, 177, II, 186).<sup>1</sup> *Bean* is found in Old French (*feve*), in Italian (*fava*), and in Spanish (*fava*), and is very common in Middle High German.<sup>2</sup>—Other words for something valueless are: ay, aye, *Trist.* 3167, *Ot.* 222; brestel of a swin, *Guy* (A.) 3680; cres, kerse, *Degrev.* 191, *C. A.* 148, I, 299, 161, I, 334, *P. Pl. C.* xii, 14 (where see Skeat); fir stike, *Havel.* 966; yvy lefe, *C. A.* 182, II, 21; lous, *Fer.* 439; nutteshale, *C. A.* 182, II, 20; payre, *Degrev.* 348, 1696; pere, *Ot.* 315, *Fer.* 5722; pese, *Al.* 5959; pyse, *Fer.* 5847; pye, *Ot.* 1157; rysshe, *Fer.* 124, *Par.* 6064; etc.<sup>3</sup> I have no example, however, of *not worth an hen*, which occurs both in Chaucer and in the *Romaunt* and on which Mr. Lounsbury lays considerable stress. Gower, he says, would never have employed "an example of so grotesque a sort. To sink even to the level of the word *bean* would have been an impossibility in his case" (II, 138). Yet Gower uses *bean* in a fairly grotesque way in

<sup>1</sup> See Dreyling, *Die Ausdrucksweise der übertriebenen Verkleinerung im alt-franz. Karlsepos*, *Ausg. u. Abhandl.*, LXXXII, 36, 37, 44: *al*, *ail*, *aillie*, *alie*, *chivot*, *escalone*, *porion*; *aglio*, *porro*.

<sup>2</sup> Dreyling, p. 45, Anm. 3. Dreyling cites Grimm, *Grammatik*, III, 729, and Zingerle, *Ueber die bildliche Verstärkung der Negation bei mhd. Dichtern*, *Sitzungsber. d. Wiener Akad.*, *Phil.-hist. Cl.*, XXXIX, 417. Professor von Jagemann has kindly referred me, in addition, to Walther v. d. Vogelw., *Paul*, 76, 4, and *Kaiserchronik*, 212, 25.

<sup>3</sup> Collections, of greater or less extent, have been made for English by Koch, *Gramm.* II<sup>2</sup>, 527; Mützner, *Gramm.* II, ii, 127; Atkinson, *Vie de Seint Auban*, p. 67; Zupitza, *Guy, Second Version*, 1875-76, pp. 396-97; Zielke, *Sir Orfeo*, p. 19; Dreyling, *Ausg. u. Abhandl.*, LXXXII, 158. For the Romance languages see Dreyling's *Vorwort* and add Heinrich, *Ausg. u. Abhandl.*, XXIX, 35-36, Binet, *Style de la Lyrique Courtoise*, p. 68.



the following lines: He woll ayeinward take a bene There he hath lent the smalle pese, *C. A.* 269. In Old French, however, cocks, hens, and chickens are all pressed into the service of the negation, and some of the phrases are much more grotesque than anything Mr. Lounsbury quotes from Chaucer.<sup>1</sup>

i. 42†. Yet Austin gabbeth not of this, 6702. (I gabbe not, *N. Pr. T.* 246; Gabbe I of this? *Boeth.* ii, 5.) Cf. Y no gabbe nouȝt, *Guy* (A.) 2470; Nil ich nouȝt of couenant gabbe, id. 3264; He can telle and gabbe nouȝt, *A. and M.* 1411; Thou gabbest, id. 1071, *Floris* 235; Y nul the gabbe, *Al.* 311; We no gabbeth the, id. 1805; Soth to sigge and noȝt to gab, *Sarmun* 191 (*Mätz. Poesie*, I, 119); Sithen that thou wilt That I shall axe gabbe nought, *C. A.* 122, I, 224.

i. 43. What! wened he that I were wood? 6792. (What! wenestow make an ydiot of oure dame? *Wife's Prol.* 311.) Bien me voloit tenir por ivre, II, 26.—Cf. Trowest thou that I were wode? *Sowd.* 1344; Weyn ye that I rafe? *Townel.* 200; Wele thou holdest me for a fole? *Guy* (A.) 383.

i. 47. Thanking hym, gan on his knees loute, 7336. (That to this lady gonne loute, *Hous F.* 1704.) S'agenouille et l'en mercie, II, 43. The similarity, it will be observed, is confined to the word *loute* in the "periphrastic preterite" with *gan*. If parallels are thought necessary, cf. Curteisly to him gan lowte, *Sowd.* 1162; She gan to lout And knele unto her husbonde, *C. A.* 401, III, 260; And atte last he gan to lout, id. 340, III, 75.

ii. 13. For in this world is noon hir lyche, 1073. (In al this world ne was ther noon him lyk, *Prol.* 412; That in this world ne was ther noon it liche, *Sq. T.* 54.) Qu'il n'ot si bele . . . Ou monde, I, 35.—Cf. In al the world was non it lyche, *Floris* 164; In the world was non it lyche, *Rich.* 5900; In all this worlde (the worlde, that londe) was (ys) non hym (the) lyke (lyche), *Guy* (Univ.) 34, 124, 1336, 2786, 3001, 11940 (all quoted by Zupitza on *Ath.* 33); In the world was non hym lyche, *Ath.* 57; In eorthe no worth him non yliche, *Al.* 402; Non in the world hit yliche, *Al.* 2644; In the world nys heore ylyche, *Chron.* (Ritson II) 622 (quoted by Zupitza,

<sup>1</sup> See Dreyling, p. 18: je ne donroie un gal, la cue d'une geline, on ne le doit prisier .i. pouchin escaudé, etc.



l.c.). Similar phrases are, — In this werld es none slike, *Yw.* 3346 ; In the werld es noght swilk twa, id. 3590 ; In the world was never none syche, *Rich.* 2309 ; That swiche be in this world non, *A. and M.* 516 ; Thei in this werld war non other swiche, id. 8616 ; In the world nis swich tur non, *Floris* 636 ; That non nas hem yliche, *A. and M.* 5650 ; Nas non his iliche, *Horn* 18 ; Nas non his liche, *Floris* 483 ; Nis no wher his iliche, *Horn* 340 ; Ther nas no kniȝt hym ilik, id. 502. Cf. also the following (cited by Zupitza, l.c.), *Guy* (Univ.) 8087, *Guy* (Caius) 92, *Guy* (A.) 824, *Bev. B.* 3887-8, *Mel.* 1052, *Florence* 18, *Chron.* (Ritson II), 360, 374, 790, 822. (See also ii. 16, — the next note, — and cf. i. 15-16, p. 36, above.)

ii. 16†. Of beaute wot I noon his pere, 1300. (In al the lond of crowyng nas his pere, *N. Pr. T.* 30, and similar lines.) Cf. In Engeland [was] non his per Of strengthe that euere kam him ner, *Havel.* 989-90 ; In al the werd ne hauede per Of hendeleik, fer ne ner, id. 2792-3 ; In al the court was ther non Of fairehed half his pere, *Amis* 1919-20 ; Of doughtynes was none his pere, *Bev. B.* 16 ; Of langage there was non hys pere, *Guy* (Univ.) 2724 ; Of ryches he hath no pere egall, id. 10832 ; Off poynttes wythe-owten pere, *Ip. A.* 27 ; Of charyte ther was none hur make, *Guy* (Univ.) 92 ; Of clergie was hir noon like, *Guy* (Caius) 92 ; In payneme ne in Surry . . . Ys none the lyke of lose ne of price, *Bev. B.* 3887-8 ; So therof was no man him liche, *C. A.* 305, II, 379 ; Of pruyde nas non heom yliche, *Al.* 2869. For similar phrases (Thou hast in eorthe no pere, In all thys worlde y knowe not hur pere, etc.) without the limiting *of*-phrase, see *Al.* 7491 ; *Guy* (Univ.) 8202, 8855, 9650 ; *Guy* (Caius) 8656, 9140, 9981, 10988 ; *Guy* (A.) st. 256 ; *Reinh.* 2, 19, 107, 113 ; *Havel.* 2241 ; *Rich.* 2321, 6392 ; *Ath.* 33, 69, 114, 704 ; *Ip. A.* 105, 960, 5777 ; *Ip. B.* 996, 1179 ; *Lib.* 126, 1325 ; *Mel.* 1588-9 ; *Chron.* (Ritson II) 68 ff. ; *Torrent* 222, 2420 ; Minot, iii, 14 ; *C. A.* 157, I, 324. — Most of the above cases are quoted by Kölbing on *Amis* 464 or by Zupitza on *Ath.* 33.

ii. 17†. God that sittith in mageste, 1339. (= *Wife's Prol.* 826, *Monk* 178.) Cf. Unto his Fader fre Where he syttes in majeste, *Townel.* 300 ; Ihesu lord, than saide he, That syttest on thy maieste, *Fer.* 3615 ; My self to sytte in majestie, *Townel.* 307 ; By God in magiste, *Sowd.* 936 ; By God that is in magiste, id. 1228 ; His Fader in majestie, *Townel.* 302 ; Oone God in mageste, id. 1 ; To God that

sit in trinite, *Bev.* 4430 ; cf. *Vern.* 784 ; Iesu that syttyth yn trynnye, *Oct. B.* 958 ; Iesu that sit in trinite, *Reinb.* 26 ; By God that sit in trone, *Fer.* 5398 ; Iesus . . . that sit aboue, *A. and M.* 28.

ii. 20†. There lay no other remedye, 1480. (Ther nas, ther is, he saugh, noon other remedye, remede, Ch.) Cf. He saugh noone other remedy, *Sowd.* 1272 ; Me think ther is noo remedy, *Gen.* 726, cf. 598. Similar formulæ are common. Thus,—couthe no better rede, *Perc.* 153, 739 ; couthe no other rede, *Par.* 2652 ; Of him war than none other rede, *Yw.* 2376 ; Of him no worth him non other red, *Guy* (A.) 6934 ; He couthe no better bot, *Vern.* 564 ; They sawe no bettyr bote, *Tryam.* 553 ; Whan Beues saw no better wolde be, *Bev. B.* 3399 ; And tho he seȝ non other it nas, *Bev.* 2502 ; The kyng saw it myght no better be, *Ip. A.* 2780 (cf. *Gam.* 299) ; I se it may not better be, id. 8177 ; The cook seygh non othyr may be, *Rich.* 3183 ; it may no nother be, *Guy* (A.) 1482 ; Hit nell non other be, *Flor.* 324, *Lib.* 332, *Ber.* 3102 ; Hit myght no better be, *Par.* 1630 ; It myȝte be no othir, *Sowd.* 1422.

ii. 23†. And doun on knees he gan to falle, 1514. (They gonne doun on knees falle, *Hous F.* 1534 ; And doun upon hir knees she gan to falle, *Cl. T.* 236.) Cf. On his knees he gan doun falle, *Rich.* 4849 ; On knese byfor hym gan thai fall, *Yw.* 2312 ; Appon his knees downn gan he knele, *Ot.* 488 ; On knes thai gun doun falle, *Tars* 90 ; Adoun on knes sche gan to falle, id. 221 ; On kneo he gan doun falle, *Al.* 6850 ; On is knes he gan to falle, *Bev.* 2889 ; I gan doun falle On knees, *C. A.* 52, I, 49 ; Upon her knees she gan doun falle, id. 91, I, 148 ; On both his knees he gan doun falle, id. 261, II, 252 ; He a-kne gan falle, *Horn* 780 ; Adoun thay gunne falle knelyng, *Fer.* 2131 ; And on hys knees he felle, *Ath.* 419 ; Athulf fel a knes ther, *Horn* 505 ; On knese thai fel doun to his fete, *Yw.* 2321 ; On knese he fell knelynge, *Cleges* 395 ; Sche felle on kneys hym agayne, *Oct. B.* 52 ; Before the emperowre on kneys sche felle, id. 245 ; Befor his lord on knes he fell, *Amadas* (Weber) 612 ; Otuwel fel on kne, *Ot. B.* 542. (See Schleich on *Yw.* 1148 ; Breul on *Gowther* 266.)

ii. 25. For if her deth be yow to wite, 1541. (A womman that were of his deth to wyte, *Troil.* ii. 1279 ; Here is she that is youre deth to wyte, id. iii, 63.) Cf. That of mi deth thou haddest wite, *Guy* (A.) 639, = That of my deth thou might bee the wite, *Guy*

(Caius) 639; His deth wille thai wite me, *Guy* (A.) 7086; Florent, how so ever thou be to wite Of Branchus deth, *C. A.* 69, I, 91.

ii. 287. O thing warne I thee, 2009. (Oon thing warne I thee, *Fr. T.* 215, etc.) Cf. But of o thyng, syr knyzt, I warne the, *Chestre* 361; I warne yow, syres, of oo thyng, *Par.* 1791; Y warne the of o thing, *Degrevant* 969.

ii. 29. Abasshed wonder sore, 2413. (Wonder sore he was abaist, *Troil.* iii, 1122; So sore abasshed was she, *Parl. F.* 446.) Qui a paor. Cf. The kyng abasched him sore, Lonelich, *Grail*, xxi, 291; The kyng abasshid sore, *Gen.* 127; He was sore abasshed, Caxton, *Gold. Leg.* 70, 3; Sore I was abasshed, *Court of Love* 239; abasshed sore, id. 275; Thenne wer the Sarezynes sore aferde And abaschyd hem in a throwe, *Rich.* 5188-89; beo sore agaste, *Fer.* 3178; agrevyd sore, *Rich.* 5267, 5287; was astoinyd sore, *Gen.* 2498. (The quotations from Lonelich and Caxton are in Murray.)

ii. 307. Of hem that bien love so dere, 2452. (That boghten love so dere, *Leg.* 258; Your love I bye it al to dere, *Anel.* 255.) Cf. I haue boughte her loue to dere, *Ip. A.* 5549; She hath my love and I have nought Of that which I have dere abought And with min herte I have it paide, *C. A.* 271, II, 278; Thus bie I dere and have no love, id.; Howe dere that love be bought, *Court of Love* 207; She mot with all her hertes thought To love and to his lawe obey, And that she shall full sore abey, *C. A.* 417, III, 303; Hur love thou schalt bye fulle sore, *Tryam.* 1403; Ye have bogt my love fulle sowre, id. 1580 (cf. also 293, 299, 1071, 1107); Der aboughte they that good, *Rich.* 660; Thi dedis schall dere be boghte, *Ot.* 108; It shall sore ben abought, *C. A.* 84, I, 130; His fader deth wel dere hi bozte, *Horn* 884.

ii. 31. Holde that in ful gret deynte, 2677. (I holde it grete deynte, *Troil.* ii, 164; Of thy speche I have gret deyntee, *Frankl. Prol.* 9.) Cf. For deynte that he hadde of him, *St. Dunstan* 35; Hade no deynte of the dede, *Destr. Troy* 967; Sho hade no deintithe to dele, id. 463; The knyght dayenteth hadde, *Sev. Sages* (Wright) 606; Of hys seruyce haue I no deynte, *Par.* 5231; Yet of hym I haue no deynte, id. 5756. (Mostly from Mätzner.)

ii. 37. He com criande as he were wood, 3138, cf. 3823. (Renne and crye as thou were wood, *Hous F.* 202; cf. *Prol.* 636, *Mil. T.* 250, *Friar's T.* 244.) Et s'escrie cum forcenés, I, 95. — Cf. Criand



so wode he were, *A. and M.* 9390 ; Brademond cride ase he wer wod, *Bev.* 915 ; And cride also he hadde be wod, id. 1403 ; And cried . . . as he were wood, *Bev. B.* 3946 ; And cried . . . as he were wode, *Eglam.* 534 ; Thay ascryede hym as thay were wod, *Fer.* 4125. (See also p. 18.)

ii. 38. Noon herte may thenke ne tunge seyne, 3183. (Ther may no tonge telle or herte thinke, *Merch. T.* 97 ; Tonge may nat telle ne herte thynke, *Pars. T.*, Gilm., ii, 250.) Cuers ne porroit mie penser, Ne bouche d'omme recenser, I, 97. Cf. Ne mai nan heorte hit ithenche ne na tunge ne can telle, *Poema Morale* 287 ; Ne tong can tel ne hert thynke, *O. E. Misc.* p. 218, v. 251 ; Ne mei non heorte thenchen ne nowiht arechen Ne no muth imeten ne no tunge techen, *O. Eng. Hom.* I, 193 ; No man may telle no thenche in thouȝt, *Orfeo* 371 ; That hert miȝt thinke other eyȝe se, *Guy* (A.) st. 17. Several cases of *ther nis no tunge that hit mai tel* or similar phrases are collected by Lewin, *Poema Morale*, p. 47 (who quotes the first two passages above) : add *A. and M.* 2115, *Bev. B.* 124.

ii. 39†. Ful of riche stones fret, 3204. (Ne juwel fretted ful of riche stones, *Leg.* 1117.) Cf. The sadel . . . With gold was fret and pretious ston, *Fer.* 3663 ; His helme and his hawberke holde, Frette ouere with rede golde, With stones of vertue dere, *Ot.* 976-78 ; Of fyne curalle and rych rubys, Of other stones of gret prys With fyne gold wyre alle about fret, *Pr. Cons.* 9105-7 ; With a flore that was fret all of fyne stones, *Destr. Troy* 1660 ; A sadill serklyt with golde, ffret ouer with fyne perle, id. 3408 ; Crownes twayn With stones fret, *Court of Love* 123 ; Forord wele and with gold fret, *Yw.* 1104 ; Thik fret with mani a thwang, id. 3160. (Partly from Mätzner.) *Riche stones* for *precious stones* is nothing unusual (see, e.g., *Pr. Cons.* 9071).

ii. 41†. Love is free, 3432 (Same, *Knt. T.* 748). A proverb. It occurs once or twice in the *C. A.* : To love is every herte fre, 59, I, 67 ; I say in excusing of me To alle men that love is fre, 75, I, 107.

ii. 43. If Love hath caught hym in his lace, 3533. So are they caught in Loves lace, 5096. (As he that hath ben caught ofte in his las, *Knt. T.* 959 ; Alle thise folk so caught were in his las, id. 1093.) —The second passage translates Mes l'Amors qui te tient ou las, I, 155, and is erroneously marked with an obelus by Mr. Lounsbury.



The first translates S'Amors le tient pris en ses giez, I, 107. — With this number should be considered ii. 32: To hem that in my lace be bounde, 2792; The more I am bounden in Love's laas, 3648. (Him so narwe bounden in his las, *Leg.* 600; Love had hym so bounden in a snare, *Troil.* i, 663.) The first passage translates Ceus que li maus d'amer enlace, I, 86; the second, Et tout ades estraint ses las, I, 111. (Cf. 5127.) Cf. He was nomen with loue las, *A. and M.* 2251; Now we be bowndyn in dethis las, *Cov. Myst.* p. 29 (Mätzner). (See also ii. 76, below.)

ii. 44†. Put him hooly in youre grace, 3556. (I am al in youre grace, *Troil.* iii, 1176.) — Cf. I put me in-to thy grace, *Fer.* 768; I put me alle in thy grace, *Sowd.* 1356; Puttes sho in the kinges grace, *Yw.* 3576; I put me therof in your grace, *C. A.* 59, I, 66; To put her in her fadres grace, id. 417, III, 305; To do him in hir grace, *Yw.* 1929; And in hir mercy y shall me doo, *Guy* (Caius) 290; In is merci y rede thow [the] do, *Reinb.* 113; In the merci y do me riȝt, id. 122.

ii. 47†. Shortly in a clause, 3725. (Same, Ch.), I have but one parallel: the same phrase is used by Chaucer's imitator Lydgate in the first of his two poems to Thomas Chaucer, *Notes and Queries*, 4th Ser., IX, 382.

ii. 48†. So was I ful of joye and blisse, 3765. (So have I joye and (or) blisse, *N. Pr. T.* 246, *Wife's Prol.* 830; Thus in joye and blisse, *Frankl. T.* 371; Ful of joye and of solas, *N. Pr. T.* 350.) As haue I joye or (and) blis, *Ip. A.* 1366, 1507, 2755, 6402; As I haue joye and blis, id. 7975; Y no schal neuer haue ioie no blis, *Amis* 1031; In herte thay hadde ioie and blys, *Fer.* 1375; Thus thai lived in ioie and blis, *Sowd.* 691; That liueth ther in ioie and blis, *Guy* (A.) 459; Wythe ioie and blys they led ther lyff, *Ip. A.* 8871; And made hir ioie and michel blis, *Am.* 1463; God ȝiue hem ioie and blis, *Praise of Women* (Auch.) 114; Couȝde no man kype Hys ioie and blysse, *Oct. A.* 111-12; With ioie and blysse, *Oct. A.* 587, *A. and M.* 6974, *Guy* (A.) 1780; With ioie and michel blis al so, *Am.* 1073; In myrth and ioie and grete solas, *Sowd.* 675.

ii. 51†. For hym fulle ofte I synge allas, 4104. (For I may synge allas and weylawey, *Shipm.* 118; Thise bacheloris synge allas, *Merch.* 30.) Cf. Singen y may Allas the time and wayleway, *Guy* (A.) st. 37; Ant singeth weylaway, *Bödd.* p. 116; Forte synge Alas ant wey-

lawo, id. p. 120; And ich may sing allas allas, *Adam* 329; The people song alas, *Sowd.* 581; He herd a frankeleyn wayloway synge, *Gam.* 197; Allas (*or* allas allas) it was his (hir) song, *Guy* (A.) sts. 21, 23, 34, 294, *Ot.* 1019, *Launfal* (Rawl.) 47; Alas and welaway was ys song, *Fer.* 5117; Allas may be mi song, *Am.* 1104; Alas may ever be my sang, *Townel.* 226; Hys song shalle be alas, id. 58; His songe had bene to ofte allas, *Par.* 3725; My song may be allas allas, id. 4552; His songe was not but wele away, id. 3550; My song is well-y-wey, *Pol. Rel. and Love P.*, p. 95, v. 63; Thy songe shall be welaway, *Bev. B.* 1232; Hure song was welewo, *Fer.* 5682; His song was waileway, *Am.* 984, 1852, 2130; Thayre sange was weylawaye, *Isumbr.* 140. (*Amis* and *Isumbras* are cited by Kölbing, *Amis*, p. LV.)

ii. 52. A fairer saugh no man with sight, 4173. (That fairer saugh ther never man with ye, *Leg.* 1600.) Nule plus bele ne pot estre, I, 126. — Cf. I saw nevure child with eye That had so moche of ffayrehede, *Bev. B.* 412-13; Hii ne siȝe So faire palmer neuer with iȝe, *Bev.* 2245-6; So fayre creaturys with ien Ne better atty-ryde were neuer seen, *Launf.* (Rawl.) 350-1; Neuer ȝet nas non fairer in siȝt, *Guy* (A.) 2764; Nowher non fairer was That he hadde seie with iȝe, *Lib.* 1901-2; A fairer place neuer nas That he seȝ with siȝte, *Reinb.* 79; Nas ther nowar yfounde in syȝt a fairer man than hee, *Fer.* 2824; The fairest man might se in sight, *Yw.* 2314; The fowlest wight That euer ȝit man saw in syght, id. 245-6; Swiche mayde nas neuer wrouȝt That thai euer hadde sene With siȝt, *Trist.* 1404-6; Ne saw y neuere o man with my syȝt Saf the bere hym betere in fyȝt, *Fer.* 5397; Sich was never none seyn with oure ee, *Townel.* 93.

ii. 56. It wol my bane be, 4491 (Same, Ch.). Ja vivre ne puis, I, 136. — Cf. That was is bane, *Bev.* 1983; Ich wolde ben is bane, id. 2006; He wyl be many a mannys bane, *Bev. B.* 2003; Myself schal thy bane be, *Rich.* 5950; Me self schal be thy bane, *Fer.* 3678; Him self schelde ther ben is bane, id. 86; I am myne owin bane, *Yw.* 1644; The water sone had bene my bane, id. 1854; Percevalle . . . Sold the knyghtes bane hafe bene, *Perc.* 1926; My nounge bane shall I bee, *Ip. A.* 4477; The wylde bare, That many a mannys bane hath bene, *Eglam.* 446-7.

ii. 61†. Suche soules goth to the deuel of helle, 5813. (Many a

wrecche . . . shal go to the devel of helle, *Pars. T.*, Gilm., ii, 253.) The phrase *devil of helle* is well known to be typical, and the fondness for mentioning the destination of souls is not less so. Cf. (1) Mony a soule to helle went, *Al.* 3957; Thaire saules wente vnto helle, *Ot.* 1502; His soule to the deucl blewe, *A. and M.* 9392; Thaire soules went alle to Lucyfere, *Ot.* 827; His saule went vnto Mahoun, id. 1340; His saule wente vnto payne, id. 1440.

(2) The deucl of helle hem mote stike, *Al.* 4726; The deucl of helle him sone take, *Havel.* 446; The deucl of hell ichim biteche, *Am.* 623 (where see Kölbing); The deucl of helle ich hii betake, *Bev.* 311; The deuyl of hel mot fetch the, *Bev. B.* 2313; The devil of hell hym spede, *Ber.* 185; The devill of hell . . . breke this thevis bones, id. 543; He was a deuyl of helle, *Ath.* 156 (where see Zupitza); What devill of hell reke I? *Ip. A.* 7713; What devill off hell is that for the? id. 7729; Se the at the devill of hell, id. 7765; were he the dwylle of helle, *Townel.* 68. — *Deables d'enfer* occurs also in the *Roman de la Rose*, I, 31, and is common elsewhere.

ii. 63. Of God nyl done it socour, 6284. (To doon him socour, *Leg.* 1476.) Et se d'eus ne la vues rescorre, II, 8. — *To don socour* is an idiom: cf., e.g., Him socour to do, *Guy* (A.) 1904; Gij wel gode socour hij doth, id. 1976; He might now do na socoure, *Yw.* 3215; To do succour upon my nede, *C. A.* 379, III, 196.

ii. 69. Be wroth or blithe whoso be, 6775. (Whoso be wroth or blythe, *Parl. F.* 504.) Qui grocier en vodra, si grouce, Qui corre-cier, si s'en corrouce, II, 25. — Cf. Wheder that he be blithe or wrothe, *Townel.* 11; Be thou wrothe or glad, *Ip. B.* 1699; Wer the maryners saughte or wrothe, *Rich.* 2615; For ben yee sele, ben ye wrothe, *Al.* 7430; Who that euer that was wele payde or wroth, *Gen.* 2246.

ii. 73†. And that is sene, 7556. (And that was sene, *B. Duch.* 413.) Cf. And that is sene, *Ip. A.* 7033, *Coventry Plays*, p. 92; And certis that is sene, *York Plays*, p. 297;<sup>1</sup> And that was seene, *Oct. B.* 888, *Ot. B.* 938, *C. A.* 95, 320 (I, 156, III, 19), *Court of Love* 131; And that is wel isene, *Havel.* 92; And that is now wel ysene, *Fer.* 2576; And that was in the Lumbardes sene, *C. A.* 43, I, 30; It es seene, *Yw.* 468; This ys seen, *Par.* 6199; *Townel.* 84; As it was

<sup>1</sup> These three passages are cited by Kölbing in his note on *Ip. A.* 1194.



there sene, *Perc.* 2268; It was wel sene, *Rich.* 4551, *Sowd.* 1173, *C. A.* 275, II, 209; That was ther ful wel seen, *Rich.* 5357; That . . . was . . . sene, *C. A.* 338, II, 70; As it was sene, id. 272, 396, 426 (II, 280, III, 247, 329); As it is sene, id. 312, II, 396; It is now sene, id. 196, II, 64; It is ofte sene, id. 65, I, 82; It is well sene, id. 370, III, 168, *Par.* 5570; It is ofte sene, *C. A.* 65, I, 82.

ii. 74. This knowe ye, sir, as wel as I, 7618. (For this ye knowen al so wel as I, *Prolog.* 730.) Cf. Ye knowen this als well as I, *C. A.* 306, III, 379; Which knewe it al so well as she, id. 337, III, 69.

Several phrases of blessing or cursing are catalogued by Mr. Lounsbury. The commonplace character of most of these is so obvious that one wonders why Mr. Lounsbury thought it worth while to rest any part of his argument on them. Yet they are found, it will be observed, in his second list. The collections of Grosse, *Franz. Stud.*, I, 208 ff., Boerner, *Raoul de Houdenc*, pp. 94 ff., Heinrich, *Ausg. u. Abhandl.*, XXIX, 40, Tolle, *Das Betheuern und Beschwören in der altromanischen Poesie*, Binet, *Le Style de la Lyrique Courtoise*, pp. 86-87, 90, afford examples of similar (and in some cases identical) expressions in Old French. Cf. also Altona, *Gebete u. Anrufungen in den Chansons de Geste*, *Ausg. u. Abhandl.* IX, Keutel, *Die Anrufung der höheren Wesen in den altfranz. Ritterromanen*, *Ausg. u. Abhandl.* XLVI.

ii. 4. God kepe it fro care! 505. (God shilde you fro care! *Shipm.* 264; God geve your herte care! *Troil.* iii, 1565.) Que Diex garisse! I, 17. — God ows schilde al fro care! *Al.* 6033; God yeff hym care! *Torrent* 1410; God gife him care! *Sowd.* 648; God yeve the care! *Rich.* 6399; So God sschilde me fram sschame, *Ot. B.* 1153; God schilde the fro schame, *Gam.* 767; God schylde us fro schame, *Eglam.* 508.

ii. 11. As helpe me God! 1028, 2732. (Same, Ch.) 1028 translates *Si m'aïst Diex* (I, 33). — Cf. As helpe me God, *Guy* (Caius) 8868; Als helpe God, *Havel.* 1972; As help thee thy God, *Fer.* 407; So me helpe God, *Bev.* 1717; So God me help, *Guy* (A.) st. 219, *Beryn* 987, 1208, 1402; So me God helpe, *Piers Pl.* B. iii, 8, iii, 248, v, 22, v, 208, etc.; God me helpe so as wyssly, *Par.* 3283.\* Highly significant with regard to the familiarity of this phrase is the clipped form *Selpe* (*selp*) *me God* (*Ot. B.* 308, 879; cf. *bisengeme* = by St. James, id. 475). The shrift of Glotoun in *Piers Pl.* is also interest-



ing testimony: I, Glotoun, . . . gylti me ȝelde, That I haue trespassed with my tonge I can nought telle how ofte, Sworen "Goddess soule" and "so God me help and halidom," There no nede ne was, nyne hundreth tymes (B., v, 374-7, ed. Skeat, 1886, I, 164).

ii. 12. And yvel a-chyved mote they be, 1068. (Yvel moot he cheve, *C. Y. T.* 214.) Mal puissent il estre arivés, I, 34. — Cf. Wele mot William cheve, Langt. p. 146 (Mätzner.); Thei cheveden the better, *P. Pl.* 61 (Mätzner.); I mighte never wel acheve, *C. A.* 101, I, 172; Ylle myght thou chefe, *Townel.* 108; One wished them ill to chieue, Foxe, *Acts and M.*, June, 1556; Fair chieve you, Ray, *N. Country Words*, 1674, p. 10; Foul chive him, Beau. and Fl., *Knt. Burn. Pestle*, i, 3; Foul cheeve him for it, Sir A. Cockain, *Obst. Lady*, iii, 2. — See Murray (from whom most of these examples are taken) and Mätzner.

ii. 15. God yeve hir right good grace, 1255. (God yeve it harde grace, *C. Y. Prol.* 112.) La soe merci, I, 41. Cf. God giffe the evel grace, *Sowd.* 2169; God geve yow euyll grace, *Gen.* 990; To gyfe the harde grace, *Sowd.* 1258; God . . . Yeue hym grace wele to fare, *Guy* (Univ.) 3604; Yff God will geve me grace, *Ip. A.* 1027; God . . . Yff grace that she mete with good, *Torrent* 2008-9. (See Zupitza on *Ath.* 180.) God ȝeue him goode grace, *Gām.* 268; Als fer as God hath yive him grace, *C. A.* 372, III, 173; God . . . geue the grace, *Piers Pl.* C. vii, 60; To gyfe the harde grace, *Sowd.* 1258.

ii. 35†. God yeve hym sorwe, 3027. (God geve hem (me, thee) sorwe, Ch.) — That god gif him sorwe, *Wil.* 2157; God gyfe the sorowe, *Sowd.* 559, *Piers Pl.* B. ii, 120; I pray God gyff yow sore and care, *Ip. A.* 4084; Gog gif the sorow, *Townel.* 9; God gif the soro and care, id. 8; Mahoun geve the sorowe and care, *Bev. B.* 898; Mahounde myghty gyfe hem sorowe, *Sowd.* 1852; Our lady gyve hym (hir) sorowe, *Ber.* 183, 489; Cryste ȝif him sorwe, *Piers Pl.* B. v, 107; Lorde ȝif hir sorwe, id. iii, 165; Jesus shilde us alle from sorowe, *Al.* 2046.

ii. 46. So God me spede, 3667. (Same, Ch.) Se Diex m'aïst, I, 111. — The extraordinary frequency of this exclamation in Middle English may be illustrated by the following examples: So God me spede, *Guy* (A.) 1722, 9819, 9821; *Guy* (Caius) 9217; *A. and M.* 3645; *Al.* 6435, 7527; *Ip. A.* 3193, 4064, 4865, 8653; *Ip. B.* 2079; *Amis* 231, 365, 1120, 1341; *Fer.* 229; *Par.* 4976; Al so God me

spede, *Rol. and Vern.* 705; *Amis* 300, 942, 1449, 2001; *Reinb.* 118; So God vs spede, *Ip. A.* 486; So (Also) God the spede, *Ip. A.* 2622, *Amis* 1205, *Reinb.* 114, *Mel.* 1239; So God 3ou spede, *Am.* 450; So Crist me spede, *A. and M.* 5507; As (So) God of hevyne me spede, *Ip. A.* 4889, 5151, 8630; There Iesu [Crist the sp]ede, *Mel.* 1245; As Ma[houn] me helpe and spede, *Fer.* 2231; That God him sholde spede, *Fer.* 342; God . . . him spede, *Reinb.* 48; Crist . . . hem spede, *id.* 59; Now God the speede, *Par.* 5028; Sped them our Lord, *Roland* 643;<sup>1</sup> The devill of hell hyme spede, *Ber.* 185; That the devill hir shuld spede, *id.* 626; Al so thi God the spede, *Vern.* 666.

Children and young people were even instructed, in manuals of etiquette, to use such formulæ in greeting as well strangers as friends. Thus:<sup>2</sup>

Whenne yee entre into your lordis place,  
Say first: *God spede!* (*Babees Boke*, etc., Furnivall, p. 3.)

If thou eny gode man or woman mete,  
Avale thy hode to hym or to here,  
And bydde *God spede* dame or sere. (*Id.*, p. 401.)

ii. 54†. I pray God yeve him evel chaunce, 4274. (God yeve thee good chaunce, *C. Y. Prol.* 40; I prey to God so yeve him right good chaunce, *Pars. Prol.* 20.) — Cf. I praye God gyff you all myschaunce, *Ip. A.* 6337; I pray God that myschauns On hym come, *Par.* 3845-46; As God 3yue the gode chaunce, *Fer.* 285; As God me 3yue god chaunce, *id.* 1268, 4766; God 3yue yuele chaunce, *id.* 1252; God 3yue hym gode chaunce, *id.* 4356; God gif him moch myschaunce, *Sowd.* 754; Mahounde gyfe hem myschaunce, *id.* 962; God giffe the evel grace And hem also moche myschaunce, *id.* 2169-70; Evele chaunse heom bytyde, *Al.* 4597.

ii. 57†. Foule hir bifalle, 4494. (Foule mot thee falle, *Manc. Pr.* 40; Foule falle hire, *Troil.* iv, 462; Fayre yow bifalle, *Pars. Pr.* 68.) — Cf. Foule mote the falle, *Ot. B.* 108; Faire the falle, *Fer.* 2260; Faire you al shal befalle, *Sowd.* 195; Foule shal hem . . . bifalle, *id.* 199; Faire the sall byfalle, *Mel.* 93; Foule hem befalle, *Par.*

<sup>1</sup> The last three citations from Zupitza's note on *Ath.* 180. Cf. also Kölbing, *Amis*, pp. XLVI-VII.

<sup>2</sup> Quoted by Kölbing on *Sir Tristrem*, v. 838.

3833; Foule mot hem falle, *Gam.* 485; Yvel mot him bifalle, id. 738; That foule him falle, *C. A.* 285, II, 318; Yvel the bifalle, *A. and M.* 1217.

ii. 58†. As god forbede. (Same, Ch.) and

ii. 60†. So god me se. (God you (him) see, Ch.) These two expressions can hardly be seriously considered. They were idiomatic and popular to the last degree. See Mätzner, s.v. *forbeodan*, and cf., for *god forbede*, *Ip. A.* 333 (and Kölbing's note), *Bev. B.* 3469, *Yw.* 984, 2323, 2367, 2589, *C. A.* 146, 160 (I, 295, 332), *Bev.* 44; for *God thee (yow) se*, etc., cf. *Chestre* 253, *Guy* (Univ.) 163, 5697, 5795, 6035, *Bev. B.* 135, *Yw.* 1597, *Bödd.* p. 129; Mahowne the save and se, *Townel.* 69.

ii. 68†. And also God my soule blesse! 6769. (God his soule blesse, Also God your soule blesse, etc., Ch.) ii. 6†. Now also wisly God me blesse, 632. (So God you blesse, Also God me blesse, Ch.) Cf. God geve hys soule moche blys, *Rich.* 3728; As God yeue vs blis, *Reinb.* 68; As wysely God my soule saue, *Par.* 5584; So Crist me blesse, *Horn* 555, *Al.* 3586; So God me blys, *Townel.* 113; Crist ȝeue(n) him his blessing, *Horn* 156; Crist ȝiue him muchel blisse, *Horn* 158; Crist the wisse And ȝiue the heuene blisse, id. 414; Blessud mot thou bee, *Ip. A.* 1863 (where see Kölbing).<sup>1</sup>

The last three parallel passages quoted by Mr. Lounsbury (ii. 75-77) require special attention. He separates them from the rest of his examples and lays much emphasis upon them. "There is similarity enough," he remarks, "to forbid the idea that they could have originated from different sources" (II, 150).

ii. 75†. Freend of affect and freend of cheere, 5486. (Frend of affect and frend of countenance, *Fortune* 34.) "With this should be compared," adds Mr. Lounsbury, "a couplet that contains the same idea in the [English] *Rom. of the R.* and the use of its rhymes in the *Hous F.*

Clerly for to se  
Hym that is freend in existence  
From hym that is by apparence, *R. R.* 5551 ff.

Allas! what harm doth apparence  
Whan it is fals in existence, *Hous F.* 265-266.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. also Kölbing on *Ipomadon A.* 429.

"The resemblance is made the more noteworthy because the words that form these rhymes do not appear in the French original." This would certainly be striking, if it were true. But, though the words in question do not occur in this place in the *Roman*, they nevertheless occur in the following passage, which, as Mr. Lounsbury has failed to observe, is the very passage which Chaucer had in mind when he wrote the lines quoted from the *Hous of Fame* :

Mes ja ne verrés d'aparence  
 Conclurre bonne consequence  
 En nul argument que l'en face  
 Se default *existence* esface, II, 47.

Thus translated :

But shalt thou never of apparence  
 Sene conclude good consequence  
 In none argument ywys  
 If existence fayled is, 7467 ff.

Cf. also *amis aparens*, I, 163.

ii. 76. If that they falle into her (sc. women's) laas, That they for woo mowe seyn "Allas !" 6032-3. (Lo, alle thise folk so caught were in hir [sc. Venus's] las, Til they for wo ful ofte seyde "Allas !" *Knt. T.* 1094-5.) Si pueent en lor laz cheoir, Qu'il lor en devra mescheoir, I, 362.—The resemblance may here seem surprising, but it becomes less so when we compare the note on ii. 43, above, and less surprising still when we observe the following couplet in *Kyng Alisaunder* :

"Woman the haveth in hire las."  
 "O," quoth Alisaunder, "alas !" 7698-9.

ii. 77.

For tyme lost, as men may see,  
 For no thyng may recured be, 5126-7,<sup>1</sup>

is compared with

For tyme ylost, this knowen ye,  
 By no way may recovered be, *Hous F.*, 1257-8.

<sup>1</sup> This couplet is not in the original. It is inserted by the translator after "Thy tyme thou shalt biwepe sore The whiche never thou maist restore," 5124-5 (*Le tens qu'auras perdu plorras, Mes recovrer ne le porras*, I, 155), to give those lines the authentication of a proverb. It will be observed that the language of the original is almost enough to supply the translator with the couplet under discussion.



And this Mr. Lounsbury seems to regard as the most remarkable of all his parallel passages (II, 151). But the phrase in question is clearly proverbial, and it would have been as much to the point to quote Gower :

For no man may his time lore  
Recover, *C. A.* 147, I, 298,

and

But so wise man yet never stood  
Which may recover time ilore, *C. A.* 192, II, 51.

Of the 126 parallels in Mr. Lounsbury's two lists I have commented on 114. Of the twelve that are left, some might fairly be called trivial, others are mere idioms, and none are of any particular significance.<sup>1</sup> But even if some of this residuum be insisted on as important, and if, further, a few of the hundred or more excisions which I have suggested fail to commend themselves to the reader, the number of parallels that actually stand criticism will still be very small,—not more than a score. If it be not admitted that these are the result of accident, they may of course be more reasonably explained on the theory of imitation, which does not do violence to the facts in any respect, than on the theory of identity of authorship, which, as we have seen, has much against it. A long string of imitations of Chaucer—much longer and much more striking than the fragments that remain of Mr. Lounsbury's list—may be found in *The Kingis Quair*,<sup>2</sup> which nobody has ever ventured to ascribe to Chaucer.

Mr. Lounsbury's passages, however, are not the only passages from

<sup>1</sup> These twelve are i. 25 (*swelte and swete*), i. 34 (*the hote ernest*), ii. 9 (*sois sounde*), ii. 10 (*as fer as I have remembraunce*), ii. 14 (*I sey no more*), ii. 22 (*shadwid with braunches (bowes) grene*), ii. 24 (*shortly at the sothe to telle*), ii. 40 (*meke of port*), ii. 42 (*rewen on thi peyne*), ii. 50 (*in Loves servyse for to endure*), ii. 53 (*do hir busy cure*; cf. busy cure, *Court of Love*, 36), ii. 55 (where Fortune is spoken of as *writhing away her heed or face*). *Dumb as a stone* and *white as milk* are mentioned by Mr. Lounsbury, but not insisted on (II, 138). The parallel *Love where that the list : Love if thee list* (II, 139) is trivial. In the passages quoted on pp. 134-5 the original is admitted to be "largely responsible for the words" of the translation.

<sup>2</sup> See the notes in Skeat's edition (Scottish Text Society, 1884) and Wood, *Chaucer's Influence upon King James I. of Scotland as Poet*, Halle, 1879 (Leipzig dissertation).

Chaucer to which parallels may be found in works older or later than his time or contemporaneous. A few such, from works which no one would think of ascribing to Chaucer, will illustrate this assertion and will serve at the same time to show the illusive nature of the sort of testimony on which Mr. Lounsbury's theory chiefly depends. Some of the parallels to be registered are more striking than others. All that is maintained regarding them is that they are on an average quite as striking as Mr. Lounsbury's; for that is of course all that is necessary for the purposes of this argument.

1. Everemore he hadde a sovereyn prys, *Prol.* 67.  
Euer more the price away he bere, *Ip. A.* 1737.
2. Unto his ordre he was a noble post, *Prol.* 214.  
To Fraunce he was a stronge post, *Par.* 1221.  
The chefe post of thy feith, *Court of Love*, 1189.
3. The miller was a stout carl for the nones,  
Ful big he was of braun and eek of bones, *Prol.* 545-6.  
He ys a myghty man for the nonys  
And wele ishape with grete bonys, *Ipom. B.* 77-8.  
Thou art strong in flesh and bones,  
And he doughty for the nones, *Rich.* 5444-5.  
Ac he his doughti for the nones,  
A strong man of bodi and bones, *Degarre* 55.  
The fairest levedi for the nones  
That miȝt gon on bodi and bones, *Orfeo* 51-52.
4. Who-so shal telle a tale after a man,  
He moot reherce, as ny as evere he can,  
Everich a word, *Prol.* 731-3.  
Blame not me, I must endyte  
As nye after hym as I can or may, *Par.* 4788-9.
5. Upon the tyraunt Creon hem to wreke  
That al the peple of Grece sholde speke, *Knt. T.* 103-4.  
Sche wold of Launfal be so awreke  
That alle the lond schuld of hym speke, Chestre's *Launfal*, 706-7.  
Off Richard sholde he be so awreke  
That al the worlde scholde theroff speke, *Rich.* 5965-6.

I wole me off hym so be wreke  
That al the world theroff schal speke, *Rich.* 6283-4.

I shull me of them so awreke  
That all the world therof shall speke, *Rich.* 1771-2.

To this day men may hear speak  
How the English were there awreke, *Rich.* 2021-2.

Ageyns Darie him so wreke  
That the world schal therof speke, *Al.* 1299-1300, cf. 2011-12,  
2519-20, 2981-2, 4193.

And Progne saith: It shal be wreke  
That all the world therof shall speke, *C. A.* 287, II, 324.

6. To Athenes to dwellen in prisoun  
Perpetuelly, he nolde no raunsoun, *Knt. T.* 165-6.

Ther thai schul be don in prisoun;  
Schul thai neuer come to raunsoun, *Guy (A.)* 5863-4.

And yf he put ony may in prysoun,  
Out shuld he neuer for no raunsoun, *Par.* 6176-7.

Armaunt that thus hath in presoun  
Partanope and thenketh for no ransoun  
He shall neuer be delyuered oute, *Par.* 6230-3.

7. If that Palamon was wounded sore,  
Arcite is hurt as moche as he or more, *Knt. T.* 257-8.

Yef he were er ybete sore,  
Thanne was he bete moche more, *Oct. A.* 841-2.

8. Shapen was my deeth erst than my sherte, *Knt. T.* 708.

O, fatal sustren, which, er ony cloth  
Me shapen was, my destene me sponne, *Troil.* iii, 733-4.

Hyt was me shape rather than my shert, *Par.* 109.

9. Welcome the sonde of Crist for evermore, *M. of L.* 662.  
Lord, ay welcom be thy sonde, id. 728.

Lorde . . . Welcome be thy sonde, *Oct. B.* 399.

Yherd be Iesus Christes sond, *A. and M.* 6551.

Iheryd . . . be Goddys sond, *Oct. A.* 865.

Thonked Iesu Cristes sond, *Freine* 192.

Thanked be Iesu Cristes sond, *Rich.* 1238.

Thonked Iesu Cristes sond, *A. and M.* 3150, 4760.

And thanked God of his sonde, *Oct. B.* 99.

- Thanked God of alle his sond, *Adam* (Auch.) 490.  
 I thanke God off his sonde, *Ip. A.* 4947.  
 Thonked God of al his sonde, *Degarre* 245.  
 Thai thonked Goddes sond, *Rol. and Vern.* 556.  
 Lord, . . . y thanke thi sond, *Guy* (A.), st. 166.  
 Mahoun he thonkede of is sond, *Fer.* 2420.  
 Thonke Godes sonde, *Bödd.*, p. 133.  
 Thankede Godes sonde, *Reinb.* 83.
10. Thou janglest as a jay, *M. of L.* 676.  
 That jangly thus lyke a gaye, *Ip. A.* 6312.
11. Is now full clene out of your remembraunce, *M. of L.* 1008.  
 Was clene oute of remembraunce, *Par.* 3025.
12. I have almost y-caught a cardiacle, *Pard. Prol.* 27.  
 He cauȝt a cardiakill, *Ber.* 493.
13. Let ech of us holde up his hond to other,  
 And ech of us bycome otheres brother, *Pard. T.* 235-6.  
 Eythyr of hem kyste othyr,  
 And becomen sworne brother, *Rich.* 1665-6.
14. But sires to yow it is no curteisye  
 To speke unto an old man vilonye  
 But he trespasse, *Pard. T.* 277-9.  
 It is the litel curteysie  
 To do me swiche vilanie, *Guy* (A.) st. 175.  
 Ye shold not say him velany,  
 But ef ye knew encheson why, *Ywain* 2945.
15. Of florins fyne of gold y-coyned rounde, *Pard. T.* 308.  
 For that the florins were so faire and bryghte, id. 312.  
 The florins newe and bryghte, id. 377.  
 Florence rede and rounde, *Isumbr.* 295.  
 Of florens that were rounde, *Oct. B.* 278.  
 Floryns brode and bryght, id. 576.
16. So that ye offren nobles or sterlinges,  
 Or elles silver spones, broches, or rynges, *Pard. T.* 445-6.  
 To pas and to wend to make hir offringis,  
 Riȝte as hir devocioune was, of sylvir broch and ryngis, *Ber.* 133-4.
17. For on the morwe as sone as it was day  
 To his felawes in he took his way, *N. Pr. T.* 205-6.



- To morwe as sone so it is day  
We wil wenden in our way, *Guy* (A.) 841-2.
18. Mordre wol out, etc., *N. Pr. T.* 235 ff.  
Ther may no man hel murdir, that it woll out atte last, *Ber.* 2293.
19. So mote I brouke wel myn eyen tweye, *N. Pr. T.* 480.  
So mote ich brouke mi rith eie, *Havelok* 2545 (cf. 311, 1743).
20. Wel nygh out of here wit for sorwe and fere, *Troil.* i, 108.  
For schame he was out of wit, *A. and M.* 6093.  
He was neiȝe of his witt, id. 3322.
21. Ther nys not oon kan war by other be, *Troil.* i, 203.  
They beon worthy to have care  
That nelleth by othre beo war, *Al.* 3029-30.
22. He was tho glad his hornes yn to shrynke, *Troil.* i, 300.  
And gunne to drawen in her hornes, *Rich.* 3835.
23. Ther is no more to saye, *Troil.* i, 574.  
There is no more to say, *Ber.* 2306.  
There is noe more to say, *Tryam.* 1513.  
Ther was no more for to say, *Perc.* 1741:  
Ther of nas nouȝt to say, *Trist.* 794.<sup>1</sup>  
There was no more than to say, *Beu. B.* 1175, 2816.
24. For it is seyð man maketh ofte a yerde  
With which the makere is hym self ybeten, *Troil.* i, 740-1.  
Ibeten with his owne ȝerd, *Ber.* 1314.  
Myne owne ȝerd betith me to sore, id. 2325.  
And make unto my self a whippe  
With whiche in many a chell and hete  
My wofull herte is so tobete, *C. A.* 144, I, 283.
25. Fortune is my fo, *Troil.* i, 837.  
Thouȝe fortune be my foo, *Ber.* 1365.
26. Wex al red for shame, *Troil.* i, 867.  
A llyttell wax he rede for shame, *Ip. A.* 364.
27. His helm to-hewe was yn twenty places, . . .  
His sheld to-dasshed, *Troil.* ii, 638-40.

---

<sup>1</sup> The passages from *Perc.* and *Tryam.* are quoted by Kölbing in his note on *Trist.* 794.

And al to-broken his scheld is,  
His helme al to-dassched ywis, *Guy* (A.) 3038-9.

28. Ek men be so untrewē  
That right anon as sesed is here lest  
So cesseth love and forth to love a newe, *Troil.* ii, 786 ff.

Ne schal me nevre atwite me  
That ihc be of love untrewē  
Ne chaunge love for no newe, *Floris* 908-10.

That I shulde thynk my lady that ye  
In youre hert couth be vntrew  
Or lyghtly chonge me for ony new, *Par.* 137-9.

And loke alwey that ye be trew  
To me and change me not for a new, id. 664-5.

29. Lat be this nyce fare, *Troil.* ii, 1144.  
Lett be thy fare, *Ip.* A. 4662; cf. 7031.

30. And Pandare wep as he to watre wolde, *Troil.* iii, 115.  
That other weep as she to water wolde, *Sq. T.* 488.  
Which wepte as she to water sholde, *C. A.* 401, III, 260.

. . . Thai weped all  
Als thai wald to water fall, *Yw.* 2235-6.

And ever onane thai weped all  
Als thai wald to water fall, id. 2975-6.

31. The devel spede hym that recche, *Troil.* iv, 630.  
The devill hym spede (MS. spech) that reche, *Bev.* 1229.  
Sorowe have that recchith, id. 1388.  
I beshrewe hym that therfore doth recke, *Bev.* 3192.  
I beshrew thaym that rekkes, *Townel.* 319.

32. For wo and wery of that compaignie, *Troil.* iv, 707.  
For febulnes, wery, and woo, *Tryam.* 418.

33. Of fyne force, *Troil.* v, 421.  
Of fyne force, *Ber.* 2110; a-force fyne, *Fer.* 972; bi fine miȝt, *A. and M.*  
6737; thurch fine miȝt, id. 4009; thurch fin vigour, id. 8959.

34. For now lyve I to longe, *Troil.* v, 691.  
Weylawey, we leve to long, *Rich.* 3638.  
Whi leve I now thus longe, *Guy* (Caius) 9317.

With these illustrations (which could easily be extended) of the fact that parallel passages do not imply identity of authorship, we may pass to

V. *Mr. Lounsbury's final stylistic argument.* — This is based on the tendency which he has observed in Chaucer "to use two words practically synonymous to denote the same thing." Though this usage, he says, is not absolutely peculiar to Chaucer, the extent of the usage is peculiar. He then gives examples and adds, "This use of words synonymous or nearly synonymous as exhibited upon the scale here indicated, is assuredly a very distinguishing peculiarity of style. The practice crops out occasionally in other writers. In no one of them, however, is it common enough to attract special attention. There are perhaps a dozen examples of it in Gower," etc. "I know indeed of no author in the whole range of English literature — at least no author of any prominence — by whom this usage has been carried to an extent approaching even remotely the usage of Chaucer. This statement, however, will need correction if the poet and the translator of the *Romance of the Rose* are two different persons. In the practice of the latter there exists the same disposition to employ synonymous expressions. It is displayed likewise on the same scale, and in the same manner." Copious examples are given, and Mr. Lounsbury closes his consideration of the test with the remark that the fact that "these combinations of synonymous expressions run through the whole of the *Romance of the Rose*, is of itself sufficient to dispose of the theory that the translation could have been the work of different hands. It tasks human credulity heavily to believe that a peculiarity of style, so marked as the one just discussed, could possibly have been exhibited by two contemporary authors. To suppose it to have been the work of three or more is an assumption that can owe its existence only to whim and has nothing whatever to do with the reason."

To quote the language used by Mr. Lounsbury on another occasion, "it is difficult to treat this argument seriously." But, since it means a good deal in Mr. Lounsbury's case, and since the other arguments in that case have been shown to be largely inoperative, a word must be said on the subject. The paragraph just quoted is singularly inaccurate. In Gower, for example, who is said to employ this double form of expression perhaps a dozen times, there are

scores of examples, perhaps hundreds. Further, even if the practice were, in English, peculiar to Chaucer and the translator, that would prove nothing as to imitation or identity; for the French original is addicted thereto in a very marked degree. In the first thousand lines of the original, for example, there are fifty or sixty instances of it, — considerably more than in the first thousand lines of the *Legend of Good Women*, the poem which Mr. Lounsbury selects to illustrate Chaucer's usage. Again, if we can find three contemporary English authors of any period who use synonyms on a scale approaching Chaucer's employment of them in verse, we shall have quite disposed of Mr. Lounsbury's test, not only as a proof that Chaucer wrote the extant version, but as a proof that that version is not the work of more than one hand.

There is no difficulty whatever in finding such contemporary writers. The authors of *Beves*, *Guy*, and *Arthur and Merlin*, romances extant in a MS. of about 1300, will serve our turn. If the first thousand lines of each of these be scrutinized, there will be discovered about 30 of these double phrases in *Beves*, 34 in *Arthur and Merlin*, and 41 in *Guy*. If the first thousand lines of the *Hous of Fame*, the *Clerk's Prologue and Tale*, and the *Legend of Good Women* be searched in the same way, the resulting figures — 31, 37, 41 — will be found instructive for comparison. Of course no exact count can be made, — the category is too elastic, — but a stricter definition will reduce the numbers in Chaucer in the same proportion as in the Romances. It is useless to discuss further this singularly ill-chosen criterion. The more it is examined, the less trustworthy it will be found.<sup>1</sup>

Before taking leave of it, however, it is well to consider one matter of detail. Mr. Lounsbury finds in Chaucer such expressions as "ful pale and nothing rody," *B. Duch.* 143, and in the *Romaunt* such expressions as "ful yolare and nothing bright," 310. "The moment we come across such a line the student of Chaucer feels himself at once upon familiar ground" (II, 157). But Mr. Lounsbury has not observed that this trick of reinforcing a word by adding to it the

---

<sup>1</sup> On the use of just such double phrases in Old French see Grosse, *Franz. Studien*, I, 238 ff., Boerner, *Raoul de Houdenc*, pp. 69 ff., Heinrich, *Ausg. u. Abhandl.*, XXIX, 42, Binet, *Le Style de la Lyrique Courtoise*, pp. 81-83.



negative of a word of opposite meaning, is one of the most familiar stylistic mannerisms of Middle English versifiers. In his note on *Tristram* 2313 (oft and vnselede), Kölbing has collected sixteen examples from Layamon's *Brut*, *Tryamour*, *Seven Sages*, *Ipomadon B.*, *Land of Cokaygne*, *Gregorius*, *Libeaus Desconus*, *Sir Otuell*, *Guy*, and *Merline*.<sup>1</sup> To these may be added *Bev.* 1387, 1884, 3374, 4476; *Bev. B.* 18, 700, 770; *A. & M.* 4282, 4582, 4806, 6789, 7914; *Ath.* 377, 797; *Al.* 6931; *Ip. B.* 726; *Oct. B.* 490; *Lib.* 128, 408, 498; *Perc.* 1994; *Pur.* 2640, 3274; *Pr. Cons.* 126; *Guy* (A.) 1034, 1480, 1546, 1938, 2468, 3146, 3696; *Reinb.* 41; *C. A.* 72, I, 99, 162, I, 336, 263, II, 256, 351, III, 115, 379, III, 196.

With the synonym argument we may regard Mr. Lounsbury's case as finished, for his appeal to the authority of the sixteenth-century editors, whose omnivorous taste in these matters is well known, can have no weight, even as *a priori* reasoning. "At the time of the publication of the folio of 1532, in which the present version originally appeared, there must have been a manuscript of Chaucer's translation in existence," he contends. "The first editor of Chaucer's complete works, according to his own statement, was moved and stirred to make diligent search for true copies of the poet's writings. In order to acquire possession of them he spent much time and labor and money. We are asked to believe that he should have succeeded in missing the genuine translation, and have taken in place of it another that was spurious. We are asked to believe that this spurious version was published and circulated in an age which read Chaucer constantly, and nevertheless met with no suspicion from any quarter as to its being a production of the poet" (II, 160-1).

The fallacies in this reasoning are obvious. There is no evidence that any manuscripts of Chaucer's version of the *Roman* were in existence in 1532 unless, begging the question, we assume that the translation now extant is Chaucer's. The *Book of the Lion*, the translation of Innocent's *De Contemptu Mundi*, and *Origenes upon the Maudeleyne* were either not in existence at that time (to say nothing of the many ballades and virelays celebrated by Gower), or

<sup>1</sup> On a similar usage in Middle High German see Kinzel, *Ztschr. f. d. Philol.*, V, 12, cited by Kölbing.

— what for the purposes of the argument amounts to the same thing — eluded the researches of the editor of the folio, as they have those of all his successors. Again, we have no means of knowing that there was no protest against the genuineness of the *Romaunt* in the sixteenth century. We can afford, however, to grant that no protest was made; for one thing is certain: the editor, in spite of his “diligent search for true copies of the poet’s writings,” failed to discover the genuine *Origenes upon the Maudeleyne* (though there is as much reason to believe that manuscripts of that work were then accessible as to believe the same thing of manuscripts of the Chaucerian translation of the *Romaunt*), and, failing to discover this, he printed the spurious *Lamentation of Mary Magdalen* (for which Mr. Lounsbury makes no defence) without a suspicion, apparently, that it was spurious, and, so far as we know, without exciting the indignant remonstrances of those of his contemporaries who Mr. Lounsbury feels sure would have come to the rescue if a similar blunder had been made in the case of the *Romaunt*.

And it should further not be forgotten that precisely that part of the *Roman de la Rose* to which the God of Love objects in the *Prologue to The Legend of Good Women*<sup>1</sup> — that part in which women are satirized — is not included in the fragmentary version that has come down to us.<sup>2</sup> It is clear, then, that, if the present translation be Chaucer’s, the manuscript which the 1532 editor discovered was a pitifully fragmentary copy. If, as Mr. Lounsbury supposes, there were several manuscripts of Chaucer’s translation extant in 1532, so that the palming off on the world of a false version would at once have been followed by exposure and by the producing of a true copy by some zealous Chaucer amateur, the question at once presents itself: Why did not this (supposed) amateur produce a good and measurably complete manuscript when Thynne published a bad and wretchedly mutilated copy? In a word, no weight whatever can be given to the argument from the authority of the sixteenth-century editors. As Mr. Skeat writes, “a very little reflection will show that the external evidence is simply worthless.”

<sup>1</sup> Chaucer, *Leg. of G. W., Prol.*, 330 ff., 436-441; cf. Skeat’s note on v. 329.

<sup>2</sup> See Michel’s edition, II, 142-148, for the *excusation* of Jean de Meung for the satire that precedes.

We are therefore thrown back upon the internal evidence which it has been the chief purpose of this paper to discuss. The result of the discussion seems clear. The affirmative evidence brought forward by Mr. Lounsbury, when reduced to its lowest terms, we have found to be entirely consistent with the belief that the translation is not by Chaucer, but by an imitator. The negative evidence, on the other hand, from dialect, grammar, and metre, if it does not show conclusively that Chaucer and the translator were two persons, still creates the strongest kind of probability in favor of that supposition. We must therefore be allowed to prefer the theory that is in accordance with all the facts to the theory that is strongly opposed to the most significant of them, and to believe that the *Romaunt* is not Chaucer's, with the possible exception of the first seventeen hundred lines.

GEORGE LYMAN KITTREDGE.

## THE ORIGIN OF THE ENGLISH NAMES OF THE LETTERS OF THE ALPHABET.<sup>1</sup>

THE words here to be discussed are words whose very existence is usually ignored, though they are in very frequent use in the spoken language and in the written as well. This is because they are for the most part abbreviated in writing, each being written by one sign, the letter itself; that is, a picture being used while we read instead the name of the letter. It is a remarkable case of picture-writing in modern use, not quite parallel to the use of the Arabic numeral signs, because these are not pictures of the numbers, but symbols representing abstract ideas, and because we are also familiar with the numerals as fully written words.

It is not a curious interest only that attaches to these words. The history of words is part of the history of civilization, and the names of the letters of the alphabet may fairly claim some small part of the interest properly belonging to the invention and spread from people to people of those signs themselves, whose invention marks one of the most important stages in the progress of the race. We speak of the A B C as representing the most elementary sort of knowledge, and so it does now; but why is it that we use this common compound word *abece* by the side of the similarly formed word *alphabet*, and do not say, for example, *ahbahcah*, or *aboco* or *aebec* instead? We learn these words so early and so seldom think of them as words apart from the signs they name, that when we do realize their existence, we are apt to take them as matters of course, as if no other names were possible. It needs but a moment's reflection to suggest that the tracing out of the history of these English words — for they have a history covering many centuries — may bring us into contact with different phases of the life of the peoples of Western and South-

---

<sup>1</sup> Much of the substance of this paper was read at a meeting of the Modern Language Conference of Harvard University in the evening of Dec. 15, 1890.



ern Europe, for this sometimes is the case with such investigations of other English words. And if we do not confine ourselves strictly to the English names of the letters, but notice some others, as we may incidentally be led to do, we shall be still more likely to come upon previously unsuspected relations.

I first give the names themselves, for there are some variations in name which it is well to note. I use a phonetic spelling which will need no explanation. They are :

*ei* ( $\epsilon^1$ ), *bt*, *st*, *dt*, *t*, *ef*, *džt*, *eitš*, *ai*, *džei*, *kei*, *el*, *em*, *en*, *ou* ( $\delta^1$ ), *pt*, *kyú*, *a(r)*, *es*, *tš*, *yú*, *vt*, *dvbl-yú*, *eks*, *wai*, *zt* (*zed*, *izəd*; this last is usually written *izzard*). Instead of *eitš* I am informed that *heitš* may be heard from some scholars in the public schools in and near Boston at least. The change is a natural one, due to the feeling that the name of the letter ought to begin with the sound represented by it. Instead of *kyú* may also be heard sometimes *kyu* or *kyuf*; the latter reminds one of the spelling *nope* (i.e. *noup*; *nôp*, or *nòp*, rhyming with the various pronunciations of *hope*, except that the final *p* differs from the full *p* of *hope* in being simply the result of closing the lips after the vowel) for the negative adverb *no*. For an old name *guy* for *y* see pp. 78, 79. Of the names of *z* the first (*zt*) is the commonest in the United States, but *zed* is not unknown. For some interesting vowel names (*eiblsžfei* or perhaps *eiblsifei* for *a*, for example, according to my recollection of what was said at the meeting of the Modern Language Association at Nashville in December, 1890, though this form is not mentioned in the printed report of the meeting) see Proceedings of the Modern Language Association, 1890, pp. xx-xxii. That these vowel names were not always confined to the Southern States appears from the story<sup>2</sup> told on Cape Cod of a man living in Truro about a hundred years ago, who in spelling his name Eleazer began with (I use the ordinary spelling) "e-myself-e" and ended with "izzard-e-r." This "e-myself-e," like the corresponding name reported at Nashville, of course means *e-by-itself-e*, and corresponds to the Latin form which has given us the word *ampersand*; see the Proceedings referred to above and Murray, s.v. *ampersand*, with his reference for *A per se*, *a-per-se a*.

<sup>1</sup> In general I write only the diphthongal forms *ei*, *ou*.

<sup>2</sup> Communicated to me by Professor Kittredge.

For most of our letter names the origin is easily given; they are the Latin names, substituted by the Romans for the older names in Greek, and in part changed in the course of time in accordance with the same laws of sound change as have governed the evolution of other Latin words which have come into English in the same way and at the same time. For those names, then, which are certainly of Latin origin we have to ask how and when they became English. Were they taken into Middle English directly from Latin, that is, from the Latin grammarians who mention what the names were, or were they taken into Anglo-Saxon, then following the same course of changes as other Anglo-Saxon words of similar form, or, lastly, did they come into English from French, which had names for the letters coming for the most part directly or indirectly from the Latin names? (A renewed influence of the Latin names at some later time is also possible.) After answering these questions we shall have left the question of origin for a few names whose etymology is not at once obvious, and in particular for those of *h* and *y*, the two whose history is most obscure.

The names of the letters as given by the Latin grammarians (see for example Keil, *Grammatici Latini*, II, p. 8, IV, pp. 49, 422, 476 ff.) were as follows (the vowels had their own sounds for names): *a*, *be*, *ce* (pronounced *ke*), *de*, *e*, *ef*, *ge* (*g* as in *gay*), *ha*, *i*, *ka*, *el*, *em*, *en*, *o*, *pe*, *qu* (pronounced *ku*), *er*, *es*, *te*, *u*, *ix* (*ex* is also given once at least; see Keil, IV, 49), *y* (presumably called *ü*), *zeta* (the Greek name,<sup>1</sup> presumably called *dzeta*).<sup>2</sup> The monosyllabic names ending in a vowel had a long vowel, or the quality of the corresponding classic Latin long vowel, in vulgar Latin, as appears from the name of *q* in French and certain forms of some other letter names in France. Our present consonants *j*, *v*, *w* had no distinct existence in the Latin alphabet. Now, if these names had been borrowed directly from Latin into Anglo-Saxon or Middle English without suffering any French influence, the names of some of the letters would probably be different from their present ones; *q*, for instance, would probably be called *kau*, as the word *cow* is pronounced now; the

---

<sup>1</sup>Of Semitic origin.

<sup>2</sup>It may be well also to mention the verses of Ausonius, *De litteris monosyllabis Graecis et Latinis*, p. 166 in Peiper's edition.

names of *c* and *g* would be different, also that of *h*, and probably that of *z*. The names were really, for the most part at least, taken from French, as is clear from the fact that only the French name for *h* explains ours, while the other French names formerly used explain almost all of ours. It is true that the Latin names were known in England before the Conquest (cf. Ælfric's Grammar, ed. Zupitza, pp. 5, 6), but so was at least one distinctly French name, that of *h* (see below on *h*).

The Old French names were as follows: *a*, *bé*, *cé* (pronounced at first *tse*), *dé*, *é*, *efe* (pronounced *éfe*), *gé* (pronounced *džé*), *ache* (pronounced *atsə*; there was also a name *ha*, but it was only a learned name taken from the Latin grammars), *i*, *ji*? (inferred only from the modern name; if it existed in Old French, as it presumably did not, 'i consonant' being used instead, it was probably pronounced *dži*), *ka*, *ele* (pronounced *elə*), *eme* or *emme* (pronounced *emə*?), *ene* or *enne* (pronounced *enə*?), *o*, *pé*, *cu* (pronounced *kü*), *erre* (pronounced *erra*), *esse* (pronounced *əsə*), *té*, *u* (pronounced *ü* probably), *vé*? (inferred only from the modern name; like *j* it is conceivable that it had a distinct name containing its sound, though this is very unlikely, as it was not distinguished in writing from *u*), *ixe*? (inferred from the modern name, but *x* in Old French writing is a common sign for *us*, and a monosyllabic name *ieus* or *eus* is indicated by the rhyme *del X*: *lieus* in the poem mentioned below;<sup>1</sup> cf. also the name *jeux* given in Ellis, *Early English Pronunciation*, III, 805, and the Latin name *ex* occurring as well as *ix*, and the second note below), *wi* or *gui*? (see below on *y*, where another name will be noticed also), *zé* or *zède*? (pronounced *dzé*?, *zé*?, *zède*?). In the line "Crions nous par Z Dieu merci," if the text is correct, the name for *z* has but one syllable. See also the note just mentioned and compare the Portuguese name *ze*.

These names are given after a comparison of those used generally in modern French until recently (see Littré and other dictionaries, at the beginning of each letter) with the names given in the Old French poem *La Senefiance de l'A B C*<sup>2</sup> (see Gaston Paris, *La Littérature*

<sup>1</sup> The rhyme word here given as *lieus* occurs elsewhere in the poem as *leus* in rhyme with *leus* = *lupus*.

<sup>2</sup> Some names can also be found or inferred by reference to the poem of Thibaut de Champagne beginning "Dou tres dous nom a la vierge Marie" (p. 121 in Tarbé's edition, and Vol. II, p. 152, in that of La Ravallière), *erre* for *r* is in



*française au moyen âge*, 2d ed., pp. 149, 274.) I have queried some names or pronunciations to indicate possible doubt; thus in the names of *m* and *n* the accented vowel was probably nasalized (cf. the names *am* and *an* in Ellis, III, 805). In the name of *z* the initial letter perhaps originally meant *dz*; if so, the sound later became *z*. Not all the names here given have been actually found written out, but the rhyme and the metre indicate in almost every case the name sufficiently well to leave scarcely any doubt. The names of consonants beginning with *e*, for example, all had two syllables (except *x*), agreeing with modern spellings in dictionaries. Names actually written out are *ache* and *ha* for *h*, *emme* for *m*, and *erre* for *r* (the last in the Joinville passage, and also in the manuscripts of Thibaut's poem according to the editors, who print *Que R* for *Querre*).

The quality of *e* in *e*, *be*, *ce*, etc., is shown by its rhyming with *lè* = *latum* (*de l'E: de lè*; such rhymes reaching back of the accented vowel are very frequent in the *Senefiance*), and the fact that the

---

Joinville (paragraph 33 of the small edition of N. de Wailly), and several varying forms are given in Ellis, *Early English Pronunciation*, III, 805, 815, and in the *Zeitschrift für neufranzösische Sprache und Literatur*, I, 16. In this last place occur for *x* the name *eyx*, and for *z* the strange form *edez*, perhaps a mistake for *zedes*, which is the form in both the passages quoted by Ellis. It is perhaps worth while to give the consonant names as spelt by Barclay (Ellis, III, 805): *boy*, *coy*, *doy*, *af*, *goy*, *asshe*, *ka*, *el*, *am*, *an*, *poy*, *cu*, *aar*, *ees*, *toy*, *yeux* (= *x*), *ygregeois* (i.e. Greek *y*), *zedes*. Those quoted by Ellis from the Lambeth Fragment (Ellis, III, 815) for the consonants are *be*, *ce*, *d*, *effe*, *g*, *hache*, *kaa*, *elle*, *eme*, *enne*, *pe*, *qu*, *erre*, *esse*, *te*, *ex*, *zedes*. Unfortunately Palsgrave, from whom Ellis, III, 805, quotes names for a few letters, does not give them all, saying instead, after mentioning *boy*, *coy*, *elle*, etc., "but in these thynges it is nat greatly materiall to be to curyous, and therfore I passe over to speke thorowly there of." What he says, however, on p. 38 (in Génin's edition) may be taken as giving some confirmation for a name *ieus*, or rather *eus* for *x*: "exémple . . . shalbe sounded *evzemple* . . . for, as I have shewed afore, this worde *ex* hath ever an *v* sounded, though he be nat written, bytwene the *e* and *x*, and the *x* by this rule shalbe sounded lyke an *z*." From this, too, we may suspect that Palsgrave's name for *z* was *izzard*. Further I quote a few words from Bescherelle, *Dict. National* (under *Z*): "On l'appelait autrefois *zède*. . . . L'ancien nom du *z* venait du grec *zêta*; il paraît même que l'on disait autrefois *zet*." See also Meigret's names given in Livet, *La Grammaire française et les grammairiens français du XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle*, p. 66 (and Ellis, *Early Eng. Pron.*, I, 33); also Livet, pp. 198, 204 (the letter names which, it seems, J. A. de Baïf gives I have not seen), and p. 501, where *ézed* is given as the name of *z*. The author here quoted by Livet was a Frenchman teaching French in London.



names occur so often in rhyme is of great assistance. For the names like *eſe*, *ele*, *eſſe*, etc., where the Latin name had but one syllable, can Italian be responsible? These are not the only cases which make it appear possible at least that the French names did not come directly from Latin, but through Italian, and it is conceivable that Provençal was another intermediary.<sup>1</sup> The name *zeta* would have lost its *t* in

<sup>1</sup> Here it seems advisable to give the modern Provençal and Old Provençal letter names so far as I have found them (omitting the vowels). For the modern dialects I find the following names in Mistral, *Trésor dou Felibrige*, but it must be remembered that Provençal names may have been taken from French: *bé*, *cé*, *dé*, *èſe* and *èſo*, *gé*, *ache* and *acho*, *ji*, *ka*, *ðle* and *ðlo*, *ème* and *èmo*, *ène* and *èno*, *pé*, *cu*, *erre* and *erro*, *èſſe*, *èſso* and *èſso*, *té*, *vé*, *icso* (or *ixo*) and *isco* (for *x*), *i grè* for *y*, *izèdo* and *izèto* for *z*. For Old Provençal I have not succeeded in proving the existence of dissyllabic forms for *f*, *l*, *m*, *n*, *r*, *s*. An examination of Raynouard, *Lexique Roman*, and of the passages there cited (the quotation under *P* from B. Carbonel I have not succeeded as yet in finding) indicates that the Latin names were kept unchanged. *B* occurs in rhyme with *me* (Raynouard, under *A*) and with *C*. This would seem to establish *be*, *ce*, *de*, *ge*, *pe*, *te*. In the Boethius occur *pei* and *tei* (Bartsch, *Chrest.*, col. 6, vv. 12, 14), representing a different dialect, it would seem, or perhaps borrowed from Old French forms. The lines in Raynouard, *Choix*, III, 248, quoted in the *Lexique* under *T*, indicate *em* as one name for *m*; but if *er* be then assumed as the name for *r*, the line "M, O, R et en contan" (*Choix*, V, 319, quoted in the *Lexique* under *M*) is one syllable short. If the name for *r* had two syllables, was the vowel of the second syllable an *a* in one or more dialects? There exist Italian dialect forms like *effa*, *ella*, *emma*, *enna*, *erra*, *essa*. A name *es* for *s* occurs in Terramagnino of Pisa (*Romania*, VIII, 193, v. 272). Mistral gives *isca* as an Old Provençal name for *x*: this I have not yet found, but it reminds me of Italian dialect forms such as *ixa* in Milanese. An Italian name is also suggested by *fintz* as a name for *y* (for which *y grec* is also used) in the *Leys d'Amors*, but this name will be taken up somewhat further on. A name *ka* for *k* was probably not unknown, and a trace of it perhaps appears in the word *kdenas*, where *k* means *ka* or *ca*, in the manuscript of the poem on Boethius; see *Romania*, I, 231 (on v. 73). Perhaps even in Latin the common limitation of *k* to use before *a* was not unconnected with its name (cf. Corssen, *Aussprache*, I, pp. 8, 9). The possible Old Provençal names for *h* will be discussed further on under *h*.

Perhaps for the Old French names of *f*, *l*, *m*, *n*, *r*, *s* the explanation is to be sought in Old French itself. In order to distinguish *em* and *en*, which would naturally take the same form, it is possible that a vowel sound was added, *m* and *n* then being no longer final, and that the other names concerned followed the analogy of these two. Such an artificial influence is possible for names of letters, where the usual sounds of the letters are expected and desired. But this would hardly explain *ixe*; to this a Provençal form in *a* would correspond.

French (though still having two syllables in Old French) if it had followed the laws which hold for French words descended regularly from Latin; and though these letter names were rather learned than popular words, yet they are certainly very old, and we shall see in the case of that for *h* at least that the ordinary laws for popular words were not disregarded. The names in *-é*, however, do not show observance of these laws, but regular forms with *oi* = Latin *ē* also existed in French formerly (*boy, doy*, etc.); see Ellis, *Early Eng. Pron.*, III, 805. It will appear later that the name for *h* itself may have early come from Italy.

Of the French names those for *j* and *v* are of course comparatively modern, and so too are our English names for these letters.<sup>1</sup> The name for *v* is evidently formed with the new value of the letter in imitation of other names in *é* (*b, c, d*, etc.), but that for *j*, if formed in the same way, would have been indistinguishable from that of *g*; perhaps the vowel *i* was selected for the final sound, partly to avoid this confusion, and partly because *J* is merely a later form of *I*.<sup>2</sup> For the names of *h* and *y*, which need a longer study, see below.

From the French names ours come easily, if we remember that the final *e* (*ə*) is regularly lost in English after a time,<sup>3</sup> that Old French *c*

<sup>1</sup> The earliest certain case I have found of a name for *v* containing the sound of *v* is in Sir Thomas Smith's new English alphabet (1568). His name for *v*, or rather for the new sign he proposes for the sound of *v*, is *ev*, evidently in imitation of *ef* for *f*, which immediately precedes it in his alphabet. Perhaps the syllable *fi*, which in Welsh spelling would mean *vi*, over the letter *v* in Salesbury's work (1547) is a name for the consonant *v*; see Ellis, III, 787. Meigret (1550) gives *ji* for the consonant *j* ("i ji consonante"; see Ellis and Livet, as cited above, p. 70).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. the analogous name *vu* for *v* in the dialect of Bologna (*Vocabolario Bolognese-Italiano, compilato da* Carolina Coronedi Berti, Bologna, 1869-74, I, p. xvii) and the preceding foot-note; also Grandgent's *Ital. Gram.*, 3d ed., p. 123.

<sup>3</sup> It is quite possible that our names *ef, el, em, en, es*, and the older form for *a(r)* are really from the Latin directly, or are from Latin and French combined. If from French, the earliest forms in Middle English might be expected to show two syllables, but the final *e* of French words was soon lost. An early instance of the spelling *ef* is in *effauz* (first syllable), see *effaut* in the New English Dictionary; and cf. *em, ess* in the same. The spelling *are* for *r* is in the line, "iij ares for iij Richardes þat bene of noble fame" (v. 21 of a poem written between 1460 and 1471; see F. J. Furnivall, *Political, Religious, and Love Poems*, p. 2, Early English Text Soc., 1866), and *aar* as the French name, so spelt for English readers, occurs about the end of the fourteenth century; see *Zeitschrift für neufranz. Sprache u. Lit.*, I, 16, 23.

before *e* and *i*, at first meaning *ts* in French, later became equivalent to *s*, and hence took the same value in English, that Old French *ch* and *j, g* before *e* and *i* had the same values as we usually give them (*tš* and *dž*), and have retained them in English, and if we also bear in mind the vowel changes in the growth of modern English out of Middle English. Thus a former long *a* has become now *ei* (*é*) as in *fate* (we have a case of this in the name of *h* which shows that Behrens's rule for *a* before *tš* [Paul's *Grundriss*, I, p. 814, § 28 a] is not universally true), long *e* is now *i* (*peer*), long *i* is now *ai* (*fine*), *er* has sometimes become *a(r)* as in *farm*, and the modern representative of the sound from Old French *ü* is *yü* (*use*). The *o* must have had the open sound in Old French to give the modern English name; if it did not, then the modern name is simply taken from the now usual value of the letter in the words where it has the long sound. Thus all our modern names become clear except those for *j, w, x, y*, and the names *zi* and *izzard* for *z*, while we have also to search beyond French for the origin of the names of *h* and *y*. I should also add that I am not sure that the French names of *j* and *v* are older than the English ones.

The name *džei* was probably made to agree in its ending with that of the letter *k* next following it in the alphabet. The name of *w* describes its shape (V and U being originally not distinguished), and it might have received the name 'double *v*,' as it has in French, but the English name is perhaps older than this French name.<sup>1</sup> There was an older name; compare what is said below on *y*. The name of *x* (*eks*) has been made to agree with the many others beginning with *e*, while *x* has in English writing the traditional value, as in modern French, and so in the name of the letter *ks* is heard.<sup>2</sup> No other consonant name had an initial *i*, so that the change of vowel

<sup>1</sup> "But the English name of this letter is *dowbwl uw* [in Welsh] . . . that is double u."—Salesbury on English pronunciation, as translated in Ellis, *Early Eng. Pron.*, III, 785. This carries the name back to the year 1547, which is earlier than any mention of a name *ve* for *v* that I have seen in French. An earlier instance of the name is in v. 37 of the poem cited above (p. 72): "A Doble W for warwike, þat god be his gide."

<sup>2</sup> In two Romance languages, at least, the name of *x* has escaped this traditional influence. In Portuguese and Catalan *x* represents the sound *š* (a proper development from *x* = *ks*), and in Catalan the name is *xeix* (also spelt *xex*),



was easy and natural, and indeed *ex* already existed in Latin as noted above. The name *zt* for *z* is in like manner caused by the influence of the other consonant names now ending in *t* (*b, c, d*, etc.). Whether there ever was an English name *ze* I cannot tell, nor am I sure that a name *zé* existed in Old French. In general it is difficult to fix the time when such changes as these took place. As the name *zt* is so common in the United States it seems to me highly probable that it was once in use in one or more places in England, though I have not as yet found it outside of this country. A good example of *zed* is in Mulcaster, *The First Part of the Elementarie*, etc., London, 1582, p. 161: "Hence cummeth it that so manie zeds in our tung ar herd, & so few sene, for dexteritie and speede in the currantnesse of writing." The other name of *z*, *izzard* (*izəd*), offers a problem of some difficulty. The highly improbable guess that it comes from *s hard* (see, however, Johnson's Dictionary on the letter *z* for the use of *hard* to describe the voiced sound of *s*) would bring in several difficulties (shifting of accent, change of vowel in the first syllable, *s* becoming *z*, and loss of *h*, not to mention the form with final *t*; see the Century Dictionary, s.v. *izzard*). There seems to be no connection with the proper name Izard. Or can it be that an Anglo-French *li zedes* or *li zede* 'the letter *z*' (cf. the name *zedes* already mentioned, p. 70) misunderstood as *l'izede*, gave rise to a Middle English unrecorded *izede*, which is the explanation of the later *izzard*? If so, the *r* in the second syllable was either a bad spelling, or if it was really pronounced must have been due to some analogy (that of words in *-ard*, like *hazard*, *drunkard*?). The shifting of the accent in a word from French makes no difficulty. Compare the line in the *Senefiance de l'A B C*, "Li Z, une lettre au gieu." Perhaps it is worth while to mention also the modern Provençal *izèdo* as name of *z*, and the modern Catalan *idzeta*.

In John Strype's life of Sir Thomas Smith (London, 1598), Appendix, Num. II, is given Smith's new English alphabet (see Ellis, *Early Eng. Pron.*, I, 34<sup>1</sup>), and the second column on the page gives his

---

while in Portuguese it is *xis* (spelt *chich* in D'Ovidio and Monaci, *Grammatica e Crestomazia portoghese*). Both names are probably due to the feeling that the name of a letter should begin with the usual sound of that letter.

<sup>1</sup> Smith's book itself is in the Boston Public Library, and the alphabet is on fol. 41.



names of the letters. That for *z* is *ezed*, perhaps the oldest form of *izzard*, and obviously the same as *ézed* mentioned by me in the foot-note on p. 70, while it reminds one also of the name *edez* (see the same foot-note). A new explanation for *izzard* is suggested by this. It seems to me that the name *ézed* means properly *et zède*, 'and *z*,' natural enough on reaching the last letter of the alphabet. We need only assume that the *é* (= and) had become joined to the *zède* in England early enough for the sound *é* to assume its English value like that coming from Middle English long close *e*, so as to give what may be phonetically written as *ized* or *izəd* in the sixteenth century (see Sweet, *Hist. of Eng. Sounds*, §§ 817-821), and that then the vowel of the first syllable was shortened so as to give *izzəd*, written *izzard*. For the accent compare the natural English pronunciation of "and *z*" at the end of the list of letters, where *and* may very well be emphatic and even drawled as compared with the name of *z*. If this is correct, as I think it is, we have here a remarkable case of retention in English of the French conjunction.

The name of *y* (*wai*) is difficult to explain, and not all that I here present concerning its origin is certain. The Middle English form to which our present name points is *wī*, and the name *wi* occurs. White notes on v. 4320 of the *Ormulum*: "Over the Greek letter 'Y,' which in the MS. is represented by 'y' [with a dot over it], is an interlinear gloss of 'wi' [I substitute *w* for the Anglo-Saxon letter] in a very early if not the first hand." I owe this reference to Professor Kittredge, like several others used in this paper, among them the passage in Paul's *Grundriss der germ. Philol.*, I, 784-5, where there are references to the Wanley Catalogue and two other places, and the name *wī* is called a "fränkisch-irische Bezeichnung . . . für *y* . . . anstatt der alten Benennung *wén*." This remark is not quite clear, for *wén* was the name of the letter corresponding to our *w*, which also occurs in the place referred to with the name *wen*. I copy the alphabet here from the Wanley Catalogue, with the letter names as given there, using, however, our common letters instead of the Anglo-Saxon forms (except þ and ð).

a	b	c	d	e	f	g	e	a	c	e	m	e	n	p	e	c	u	e	r	e	s	t	e	i	x
A	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	k	l	m	n	o	p	q	r	s	t	u	x					
wi	and	wen	thorn	thorn																					
y	&	w	þ	D	[with a stroke across the vertical line]															thorn					
																				ð	(deest z)				

A second reference in the *Grundriss* to *Anglia*, 8, 332, yields nothing for my present purpose, but the third to Gregory of Tours, *Historia Francorum*, 5, 4 (it should be 5, 44; the reference is correctly given by M. Bonnet in *Le Latin de Grégoire de Tours*, p. 167), gives us useful information. The passage that concerns us reads (I quote from the edition in the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*): [Chilpericus rex] Addit et litteras litteris nostris, id est  $\omega$ , sicut Graeci habent,  $\alpha\epsilon$ ,  $\theta\epsilon$ ,  $uui$ , quarum characteres hi sunt:  $\omega$   $\Theta$ ,  $\alpha\epsilon$   $\psi$ , the  $Z$ ,  $uui$   $\Delta$ . Et misit epistulas in universis civitatibus regni sui, ut sic pueri docerentur, ac libri antiquitus scripti, planati pomice rescriberentur. These lines are at the end of cap. 44.

Now the object of adding new letters to the alphabet was of course to provide signs for sounds which had none already or at least no simple signs. Disregarding the new vowel letters, evidently intended to make it possible to distinguish open  $o$  and  $e$  from close  $o$  and  $e$ , and considering only the other two, we may be sure that the name *the* was meant for a sign to designate the sound  $p$  (our *th* in *think*) and perhaps also the sound  $\delta$  (our *th* in *this*), and the name *uui* (that is *wi*) for a sign corresponding to our *w* in value. We should naturally indeed have suspected at the start that our name for *y*, beginning as it does with the sound of *w*, belonged at first to that letter and not to *y*. (I do not think it necessary to take time to show that *uu* meant the sound of our *w*, nor that *th* was early used with the values it has now in English.) Now the sounds  $p$  (or  $\delta$ ) and *w* are well known to have existed formerly in all the Teutonic dialects, including Frankish. The sound  $\delta$  at least existed, it is highly probable (for Latin intervocalic *d'*), in the vulgar Latin of Gaul at the time, and so almost certainly did *w* in such words as *habui*, *voluit* (pronounced about like *abwi*, *volwit*). The older Latin *u consonans*, which we generally write as *v*, had indeed become a labial spirant, but the vowel *u* in such words as those mentioned had probably become a consonant, *w*. Moreover, the sound of *w* probably, and very likely  $p$  or  $\delta$  or both, were common in the Celtic speech of Gaul. See Brugmann's *Grundriss*, I, §§ 173, 177, 371-374, and Gröber's *Grundriss*, pp. 364 (§ 25), 615, 616, and Meyer-Lübke, *Grammatik der roman. Sprachen*, § 402. There is no good reason for supposing that the name *uui* meant a sound which would be thought of in connection with the letter *y*. Chilperic's signs were indeed taken from the Greek alphabet, but their Greek values were entirely ignored.

A hypothesis which, as not being a specialist in Celtic philology, I can only suggest with diffidence, has occurred to me to explain the origin of the name *wi*. It is that the Latin letter names spread with the Latin alphabet to Celtic tribes, first presumably to those in Northern Italy, that these Celts, recognizing *u consonans* as a distinct consonant, coined for it the name *we* (cf. the modern German name for *w*) on the analogy of the names *be*, *ce*, *de*, etc., and pronounced all these names with a long vowel. The *ē* then later became *ī*, either because these names were older than the change of original *ē* into *ī* in Celtic (cf. Brugmann's *Grundriss*, I, § 74), or because among Celtic tribes bordering on Roman speech the correspondence of Latin *ē* with Celtic *ī* led to confusion in these words from Latin. It must be remembered that they were necessarily not a part of the popular vocabulary, and so such mistakes were perhaps more easily made or more easily gained currency among the few persons who would have occasion to use these words, at least when for this one of them (*wī*) there was no accepted Latin word.<sup>1</sup> (I only mention here the Italian names *bi*, *di*, etc., without venturing to assert a connection.) Then the names may have spread perhaps to one or more Teutonic tribes in this form with *ī*, at least for the name *wī* among the Franks, as well as to the Celts in Gaul. For this possible influence on Teutonic dialects compare the history of the word *rich* in English,

<sup>1</sup> In connection with the possible name *wi* for a sign meaning *w* in one or more Celtic dialects see Zeuss and Ebel, *Grammatica Celtica*, p. xxvii of the preface and p. 1059: Nemnivus istas reperit literas vituperante quidam [sic] scolastico saxonici generis quia brittones non haberent rudimentum at ipse subito ex machinatione mentis suae formavit eas ut vituperationem et hebitudinem deieceret gentis suae, de figuris et de nominibus dicens. a *alar*, b *braut*, . . . m *muin*, n *nihn*, . . . u *uir*, x *ieil*, y *oyr*, z *zeirc*. . . . Also in the note on the same page: Ceterum cum nominibus *muin*, *nihn*, *uir* conferenda sunt nomina hibernica litterarum *muin*, *nin* (*nion*), *ur*. And in the same note *wyr*, in Welsh = grandson, is given as the modern form of the word *ulr*. But this does not prove an old Welsh name beginning with the consonant *w*, for such a name should have initial *gw* in all but the very earliest Welsh; see Brugmann, *Grundriss*, I, § 173. On Nemnivus's letter names and their date, see also the Wanley Catalogue (referred to by Zeuss) and the reference there to Hickes's Grammar; also Lecture vii in Rhŷs's *Lectures on Welsh Philology*. I have found no Irish name for *y*. The letter was scarcely used in Old Irish (see Windisch, *Irische Grammatik*). The name of *x* given here (*ieil*) has a certain resemblance to the Old French *ieus* or *eus*.



*reich* in German (see Kluge, *Etym. Wört.* s.v. *reich*). If, however, a name *wi* was brought into German use in this way, it was afterward replaced by the form in *e* (*we*), agreeing with so many other letter names in Latin and consequently in German also. Perhaps the German name was a German invention, not a later substitute for older *wi*.<sup>1</sup>

Just as the name *ache* in the Wanley Catalogue cited above is immediately from a Romance, and, more exactly, a French source, so perhaps is the name *wi*, for the application of this name to the sign *y* may very well have taken place first in France. In the *Senefiance de l'A B C*, already mentioned, are the lines (Jubinal, *Contes, Dits, Fabliaux*, II, 287, 288):

La maniere dirai du Y  
 Deus lettres samble au non Y;  
 . . . . .  
 Et sachiez bien que li Juy  
 Apeloient Jhesu par Y.  
 La lettre est deliée et fix,  
 Et maintes genz l'apelent fix;  
 Mes je vous di que c'est faus nons  
 Et que de Y est ses renons:  
 Ainsi l'apelent li Geu  
 Et li Ebrieu et li Caldieu.

From these lines it appears that the name was monosyllabic, ending in *i* and beginning with a consonant. It is at least possible that this consonant was *w* or a sound coming from an older *w*. The usual French form for *wi* would be *gui*, and this, if it existed, may have been Anglicized as well as *wi*. In an English-Latin dictionary of the year 1552, with the title *ABCedarium Anglico-Latinum, pro Tyrunculis Richardo Huloeto exscriptore*, at the beginning of the letter I, I find the words: "And albeit that in the barbarous Greke, and latine tonges, there be diversities betwene the fygure I, whych the Grekes

<sup>1</sup> It seems not impossible also that there was some connection between the name *wi* and the Anglo-Saxon *wyn(u)*, the name of the *w* rune. On this Anglo-Saxon name see the *London Academy*, April 11, 1891, Vol. XXXIX, pp. 348, 284, and the references there given.



call *Iota*, and the element Y, whyche they call *guy*, yet nevertheles the one often representeth the other."

The fact that *y* in writing meant the same thing as *i* when it was used in French may have assisted in this transfer of the name ending in *i*, especially as in all but a few dialects of Old French there was no occasion for the use of a *w*, and hence no need of any name for it, while *y* also was but little used, and hence its own traditional name, if it had previously had one of its own in France, might easily get forgotten or confused with another very little used name. This may explain also the somewhat clumsy names for *w* in modern French and English, and the almost equally awkward name for *y* (*i grec*) in modern French, the former names, at least, being of comparatively late coinage.

That there was another and a peculiar name for *y* (not connected with English *wai*) is shown by the extract just given from the *Senefiance de l'ABC*. The form there given, *fix*, reminds me of an Italian name for *y*, namely, *fio*, and I find a similar Provençal name, *fintz*, in the *Leys d'Amors* ("De la natura de y grec. De y apelada fintz deu hom saber," etc. Gatién-Arnoult, *Monuments de la littérature romane*, I, p. 44). For Italian *fio* see for example F. Novati in the *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana*, XV, 380, 388 (with the remarks on p. 383), 393, 396. One is tempted to connect these names, or at least the Italian one, with Greek  $\phi\iota$ , the name of the letter immediately following  $\upsilon$  in the Greek alphabet; cf. Tommaseo and Bellini, s.v. *fio*. This might explain the sense cited below from Fanfani, and the use in "Dall' a al fio" mentioned by Novati, which corresponds to our "from alpha to omega." Fanfani defines *fio* as "un segno che si poneva in fine de' nostri alfabeti antichi come sigla significativa di tal sillaba; e trovai usato *Un fio* per Niente o Nulla," and he also gives it as a former name for *y*. It is difficult to see any Teutonic source (such as a German pronunciation *fi* for *vi* as a barely possible name for *u consonans* after it became a true *v*, or as a name coined from the resemblance of Y to a V resting on an I) which could be plausibly urged. But an examination of Italian dialect forms of the letter names has given another and better solution. In Boerio, *Dizionario del Dialetto Veneziano*, I find *fio* meaning *y*, "la penultima lettera dell' alfabeto. Essa fu chiamata Fio dai Veneziani nello stesso significato di Figlio, fin da quando s' introdusse anticamente

l' uso di premettere in certe scritture l' iscrizione delle iniziali greche Π Υ Α, ch' esprimevano la Santissima Trinità : il Π indicando il Padre (Πατήρ [sic]), l' Υ il Figliuolo (Υἱός) e l' Α lo Spirito Santo (Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα [printed with Η instead of Π]). Dunque la seconda che alludeva al Figlio fu detta da Veneziani, Fio, e quindi l' Ipsilonne ebbe il medesimo nome. Questa nozione si ha dalla grammatica greca di Aldo Manuzio, stampata nel fine del 1400." And *fio* is separately given as the Venetian form = Italian *figlio*, Latin *filius*. It thus becomes necessary to look for the authority to which Boerio refers, and although I have not been able to consult the Greek grammar printed at the end of the fifteenth century, yet I have found an edition printed early in the sixteenth century with the title *Grammatica Aldi. Aldi Manutii Romani institutionum grammaticarum, libri quattuor, ad exemplar Aldinum ab Ascensio cum accentibus graecis restituti*. The copy in the College Library is imperfect, at least one leaf being missing at the end, but on the next page to the last in that copy (fol. clix) I find : " Illud etiam non preteriri silentio debet, Christianos olim in libris sacris ineffabilis nomina Trinitatis, Pater, Filius, Spiritus sanctus primis graecis characteribus scribere consuevisse : hoc est T. [sic] pro pater, Y. pro filius, A pro spiritus sanctus. Nam Pater, πατήρ graece dicitur : & Filius, Υἱος [sic] & spiritus sanctus πνεῦμα ἅγιον [sic]. Quapropter (quia ubi erat scripta litera Y, dicebant filius) nunc in alphabeto etiam ea litera in gallia [sic] cisalpina filius dicitur, vulgo sic fio. ¶ Σeta [sic] pro ypsilon : vel y graeca. zeta. Id colligitur ex libris decretorum distinctione lxxij." The words for Z are evidently misplaced.

From the use of the word *distinctio* in this passage it appeared after some little search that the passage referred to was in the *Decretum Gratiani*, where it is indeed to be found. This *distinctio* lxxiii appears, to be sure, to be an addition by Paucapalea, but even in that case it still belongs to the twelfth century (see A. L. Richter, *Lehrbuch des kathol. u. evangel. Kirchenrechts*, 8. Aufl., p. 149, and Massen's article on Paucapalea in the *Sitzungsber. der Wiener Akad. Philos.-histor. Classe XXXI*, 449 ff.). I quote from the *Corpus juris canonici* (editio Lipsiensis secunda, pars prior, col. 260) : Qualiter vero commendaticia, vel dimissoria seu formata epistola facienda sit, videndum est. Debent namque litterae graecae interponi in ea epistola, et non sine causa. Greca enim elementa litterarum numeros

etiam exprimere, nullus, qui vel tenuiter greci sermonis noticiam habet, ignorat. Ne igitur in faciendis epistolis canonicis, quas mos Latinus "Formatas" vocat, aliqua fraus falsitatis temere presumere-tur, hoc a Patribus CCCXVIII. Niceae congregatis saluberrime in-ventum est et constitutum, ut formatae epistolae hanc calculationis seu supputationis habeant rationem, id est, ut assumantur in supputatio-nem prima greca elementa Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus sancti, hoc est, II. Y. A. que elementa octogenarium et quadringentesimum et primum significant numerum. . . .

Exemplar formatae epistolae, que in Nicena Sinodo a CCCXVIII. Patribus facta est.

In nomine Patris II., et Filii Y., et Spiritus sancti A. II. Walterio Spirensi episcopo ego Burchardus sanctae Vormaciensis ecclesiae de-votus gregis Christi famulus, in Deo vero summae felicitatis beatitu-dinem, etc.

Cf. also the passages referred to by the editor of the *Corpus juris canonici*; for example, *Ivonis Carnotensis Decretum*, VI, 433-435 (coll. 540-542 in Vol. 161 of Migne's *Patrologiae cursus completus*).

It thus appears that a connection between the letter Y and the word for 'son' was sufficiently established to explain the Italian *fio*, and also Old French *fius* (spelt *fix*), but not at once the Provençal *fiutz*.<sup>1</sup> Can this latter have suffered influence from *fin-s* = Latin *finis*, as representing a sign at or near the end of the alphabet? I do not find that any other dialect except Venetian has its word for 'son' also as a name for y, but the Venetian name itself seems to have spread somewhat in Northern Italy. The Rhæto-Romance dialect of Friuli, according to the *Vocabolario friulano dell' Abate Jacopo Pirona* (Venice, 1871), has *fio* for y, with the explanation: "così chiamavasi dai vecchi maestri quella lettera dell' alfabeto, poichè con essa solevasi indicare greicamente la seconda persona della SS. Trinità," and in Milanese, according to Cherubini, there exists a vul-gar name, *fixa*, for y, a form evidently due to *fio* influenced by *ixa*, the Milanese name for x. I also find *fio* as well as *ipsilon* for y in

<sup>1</sup> I find neither the Old French word in this sense in the dictionaries, nor the Provençal *fiutz*. The spelling for Old French *fix* should perhaps be in this poem *fieus* rather than *fius*; cf. Tobler, *Vrai Aniel*, 2d ed., pp. xxv ff., and Suchier, *Aucassin und Nicolette*, 3d ed., pp. 67, 68, also the rhyme word *fix* in the *Senefi-ance*, which I do not understand.



the *Vocabolario domestico Ferrarese-Italiano*, by Carlo Azzi (Ferrara, 1857), and, as the dictionaries and Novati's paper already referred to show, *fio* was also used in Tuscany as early as the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

What, now, is the ultimate source of the name of *h* which, as we have seen, came into English from French? As appears from the extract below from the *Senefiance de l' A B C* already quoted, the traditional Latin name *ha* was also known in France, — it occurs in Ausonius apparently, at the end of a line, — but it can only have been a learned name, for Latin *h* had become silent centuries before, while *ache*, doubtless then as later the common name of the letter, has the look of a regularly developed French word. The lines (in Jubinal's *Contes, Dits, Fabliaux*, II, p. 278) are :

Après vous conterai de l'Ache,  
 Qui par desouz d'un pié se lace.  
 Li uns dist ache, l'autres ha :  
 Sans movoir langue dist on : ha.  
 H est uns hus, H est uns criz ;  
 Par H ot mult mal Jhesu-Criz.  
 "Ha ! ha !" fesoient li Gieu  
 Quant li bon l'apeloient Dieu,  
 "Tu n'es mie tels com tu dis :  
 Nous connoissons trop bien tes dis."  
 Et Ache miex arme resamble  
 Que nule lettre, ce me samble.  
 A glaive morut en croiz Diex,  
 De quoi il fu et joie et d'els.

(As in the previous extracts I have not attempted to make even some obvious corrections in the text, but in the second line the rhyme and the sense indicate a change: *lace* should apparently be *lasche* with a silent *s*, the sense being, 'which lets one foot hang down below.')

---

<sup>1</sup> I see no other way of restoring the rhyme. Perhaps the dialect form should properly be *ake* (for Cambrai see Map IV in Gröber's *Grundriss*, Vol. I), but it is easy to assume the adoption of the Central French *ache* for a learned word like this. Cf. also the rhyme *douce : atouche* under M in the same poem.



Now, the French name *ache* compared with Italian *acca* points directly to a vulgar Latin *acca* as the source of both words. How did such a Low Latin name come into existence, and why did *ha* disappear (except as a book word)? The latter question is easier to answer than the former; *ha* was lost because Latin *h* being very early lost in popular speech, it became identical with the name of *a*. The Latin grammarians furnish indirectly an explanation of the form *acca*, though they give only *ha* as the name of *h*. I quote a few passages from Keil, *Grammatici Latini*:—

1. Diomedes (Keil, I, 421). Litterae quibus utimur XXIII hae sunt a b c d e f g h i k l m n o p q r s t u x y z. (This complete list is not usually given. He goes on afterwards much like the others.)

2. Priscianus (Keil, II, 7-9). Accidit igitur literae nomen, figura, potestas. Nomen, velut a, b, et sunt indeclinabilia tam apud Graecos elementorum nomina quam apud Latinos, sive quod a barbaris inventa dicuntur . . . sive quod nec aliter apud Latinos poterant esse, cum a suis vocibus vocales nominentur, semivocales vero in se desinant, mutae a se incipientes vocali terminentur, quas si flectas significatio quoque nominum una evanescit. Vocales igitur, ut dictum est, per se prolatae nomen suum ostendunt, semivocales vero ab e incipientes et in se terminantes, absque x, quae ab i incipit . . . mutae autem a se incipientes et in e vocalem desinentes, exceptis q et k, quarum altera in u, altera in a finitur, sua conficiunt nomina. h enim aspirationis magis est nota. [And on p. 9:] sunt igitur vocales numero quinque: a e i o u. utimur etiam y Graecorum causa nominum. . . . Consonantium autem aliae sunt semivocales, aliae mutae: Semivocales sunt, ut plerisque Latinorum placuit, septem: f l m n r s x. . . . Reliquae sunt mutae, ut quibusdam videtur, numero novem: b c d g h k p q t. [And on p. 13:] auctoritas quoque tam Varronis quam Macri teste Censorino nec k nec q nec h in numero adhibet literarum.

3. Probus (Keil, IV, 49, 50). Nunc omnes Latinae litterae dumtaxat sunt numero XXIII. hae nominantur vocales semivocales et mutae. . . . Vocales litterae sunt numero quinque . . . a e i o u . . . Semivocales consonantium litterae sunt numero septem . . . f l m n r s x. at vero secundum metra Latina et structurarum rationem subiectae vocalibus nomina sua efficiunt, ut ef el em en er es ex. . . . Mutae consonantium litterae sunt numero novem. hae nec per se pro-

feruntur nec per se syllabam facere possunt. per se hae non proferuntur, siquidem vocalibus litteris subiectis sic nomina sua definiunt, ut puta be ce de ge ha ka pe qu te.

4. Donatus (Keil, IV, 367, 368). Littera est pars minima vocis articulatae. litterarum aliae sunt vocales, aliae consonantes. consonantium aliae sunt semivocales, aliae mutae. vocales sunt . . . a e i o u . . . sunt autem [semivocales] numero septem, f l m n r s x . . . sunt autem [mutae] numero novem, b c d g h k p q [*misprinted* p] t.

5. Servii Commentarius in Artem Donati (Keil, IV, 422). Semivocales sunt septem, quae ita proferuntur, ut inchoent ab e littera et desinant in naturalem sonum, ut ef el em en er es ix . . . mutae sunt novem, quae debent inchoare a naturali sono et in vocalem e litteram desinere, ut b g et reliquae. ex quibus tres, quoniam non desinunt in e, contumeliam patiuntur, h k q.

6. Pompeii Commentum Artis Donati (Keil, V, 101). Mutae e contrario inchoant a naturali sono et desinunt in vocalem sonum, ut est be ce de ge ha ka pe qu te.

These and many other passages I read before the easy solution of my problem presented itself. The grammarians as a rule do not give the whole list of letters and then divide them into classes, but they present them only by classes, as vowels, semivowels, and mutes, and this must have been the way in which the letters were often, if not commonly, taught and learned. The list for mutes brings *h* and *k* close together, it will be observed. Now, *k* in Latin was very little used, and its name therefore was not very important, while *h* was very often written, though it early ceased to represent any sound of the spoken language, so that its name reduced itself to *a*. This combining with the following name, *ka*, as the names of the nine mutes were recited, gave a new name, *aka*, applied naturally enough to *h*. It is quite possible that the name *ka* was still kept alive by the side of this for the almost unused *k*.

But it is *acca* or *akka* with a double consonant which we need to explain the Italian and French forms. To get this we may take one or the other of two explanations. We may suppose in the first place that the name arose in Italy and spread from there into France early enough for the popular treatment of *cca* after a vowel to result, and we assume, in order to explain the accent in French and Italian, that the new word had its accent on the first syllable. It is obvious that

we could not predict in such a case which of the two syllables would have the accent. Then the doubling of the consonant would be an Italian development; cf. Gröber's *Grundriss*, p. 535, § 89, and as a still closer parallel than the cases mentioned there, the Italian *abbicci* as name of the alphabet, A B C. Or secondly, if we reflect that such a list as this of the mutes was likely to be repeated somewhat slowly, with a slight pause between successive names, we may find a sufficient phonetic explanation which leaves the question of Italian origin open. The main difference between *aka* and *akka* (*acca*) is that in the latter the *k* position of the tongue is (inaudibly) held longer, there is an interval of silence between the almost noiseless closure of the breath passage at the back of the mouth which ends the first syllable, marking the coming *k* (or making the first *k*), and the breaking of that closure, which, giving the sound we hear as *k*, begins the second syllable. Between *akka* thus understood and *a* + pause + *ka* there is so little difference that the former might easily arise from the latter as a result of mishearing or imitation, one or both.<sup>1</sup>

We may then, it would seem, assume as vulgar Latin forms *acca* (for Italian and French), and perhaps also *dca*, *accá*, and *acá*, there being no difficulty about the accent on the last syllable with the origin explained above. But besides *acca* there is actual evidence for the existence of only one of these, namely *acá*. The Portuguese name of *h*, *agá* (or *hagá*),<sup>2</sup> points to this form, and confirms our

<sup>1</sup> The Italian dialect forms for the name of *h*, so far as I have been able to find them, and I have found a considerable number, are either *acca* or *aca* (the latter in dialects which simplify double consonants, and I think only in such) except in the case of Sicilian, where, according to the *Dizionario Siciliano-Italiano* of G. Biundi (Palermo, 1857), the name is *acchi*. In Sicilian one would expect *effi*, *elli*, *emmi*, etc., corresponding to ordinary Italian *effe*, *elle*, *emme*, etc., but so far as I can find the names they are like ordinary Italian except *ichisi* for *x* (= Italian *icchese*, *iccase*) and *'nzeta* for *z*. But I doubt the pure Sicilian character of these except that for *x*, which occurs in the phrase *testa ad ichisi* = *cervel balzano*, and that for *z*, and suspect them of being importations. From *ichisi* I infer that very likely *effi*, *elli*, *emmi*, etc., may have existed, and that they influenced the name of *h*, so that it has taken the same ending. For the dialects of Sardinia *acca* is the form according to Spano, *Vocabolario Sardo-Italiano e Italiano-Sardo*.

<sup>2</sup> D'Ovidio and Monaci, *Grammatica e crestomazia portoghese*, give the name as *haga*, but I find no authority for a form with the accent on the first syllable. *Os hagás*, 'the *h*'s,' occurs in Bluteau, *Vocabulário português e latino* under the letter H.



explanation, if confirmation were needed, by showing that the same primitive source explains this form with its different accent as readily as it does the Italian and French names. It is probable that the Spanish name *ache* or *hache* is a later substitute for an older name of the same form as that preserved in Portuguese, and was due to an influence or borrowing from France.

In view of such influences as this, and the connection between the Italian and the French name, it becomes of interest to know what the Old Provençal name of the letter was. Unfortunately I am not able to give any but modern forms for the word. Mistral gives *ache* or *acho*, the latter of which would point to an old form *acha*, but as other letter names have also in modern Provençal double forms with *e* and *o* (see the note, p. 71), it is quite possible that the two endings are due merely to the acceptance of the common ending *o* in feminines, and that *o* in *acho* does not represent older *a*. If it could be shown that some or all of these other letters had forms in *-a* in Old Provençal, and that the modern names were not borrowed themselves from French, for example, then the assumption of an old form *acha* would be easy. I may here call attention to the fact that the names given by Mistral for *x* and *z* have only the final *o*; cf. French *ixe* and *zède*. To remove doubt it will be necessary to find the old name or names for the letters in Provençal, where thus far I have only met those previously given. Doubtless others occur. The modern Catalan name may also be of use in assisting to determine the Old Provençal form. It is *hach*,<sup>1</sup> or phonetically *ak*. If this represents the first part of original *acca* (the second syllable having perhaps been later lost, as being the name for *k*?), then we should have some further evidence for the existence of Old Provençal *aca* by the side of *acha*, the two forms representing of course different dialects; cf. Map V at the end of the first volume of Gröber's *Grundriss*.

Such examination as I have been able to make of Rhæto-Romance books has resulted in giving only one name for *h*, and this is in only one dialect, that of Friuli. In the already cited *Vocabolario Friulano* I find *ache* for *h*, which I think is from the Venetian name *aca*;

<sup>1</sup> To the island of Majorca we may look for further testimony for Catalan. The *Diccionari Mallorquí-Castellà* per Don Pere Antoni Figueri (Palma, 1840) gives for *h* the name *hdtxc*, which, however, seems to be merely taken from Spanish (*h*)*ache*. It gives for *k* the name *ka*.



cf. in the same work *vaçhe* = *vacca* (the sign *çh* seems to indicate a forward or palatal variety of *k*) and Meyer-Lübke, *Gramm. d. roman. Sprachen*, I, §§ 409, 413, 541, and Gröber's *Grundriss*, I, p. 479. The Roumanian *h* represents a peculiar sound, and does not correspond to the Latin *h* in its origin, and its name, as appears from grammars which I have consulted, is the same as that for the Cyrillic letter X formerly used to represent the same sound in writing the language.

I have now traced the history of our modern letter names back to their sources so far as I have been able, and in consequence have had occasion to examine somewhat the corresponding names in some other languages. It was not my plan to discuss all the names used in all the modern languages which use the Latin alphabet, nor to examine what has become of such names as that of *ι* in Greek, where we have the word "jot," though not as a letter name. At least one of these words, the Italian *acca*, is often enough written in its full form, and used in a derived sense (*non vale un' acca*, 'it isn't worth a straw') to deserve mention in etymological dictionaries, and on the principles which Körting has followed in his useful *Lateinisch-romantisches Wörterbuch* it seems to me clear that the two vulgar Latin forms *acca* and *accá*, and even all the Latin names of the consonants, including *z*, with their common Romance derivatives, should appear in a second edition of that work. These words, though at the beginning arbitrarily formed, somewhat as the word *gas* was invented, have now become, in various forms, widely used, and these various forms are in part the result of regular action of phonetic laws, subject to the same disturbing influences, analogy, for example, as show themselves in other words, and in part the result of a learned tradition which has never wholly lost its force.

E. S. SHELDON.

## V

### LOK-SOUNDAY.<sup>1</sup>

THE most interesting linguistic problem in William de Shoreham's *Hymn to the Virgin*<sup>2</sup> presents itself in the line:—

“Al here joyen a lok Sounday” (289).

Mätzner's<sup>3</sup> comment is: “Diese Worte sind uns unverstündlich.” Morris, however, seems to have understood the difficult word *lok*, for he quotes the whole stanza in his edition of the *Ayenbite of Inwyte*<sup>4</sup> to illustrate the word *lokes*, which occurs three times in the *Ayenbite*. The meaning of *lokes* in the *Ayenbite* (it is not known to occur elsewhere) is made certain both by the context in which it stands and by the French word which it translates. The three passages are as follows:—

“Vor god him heþ zuo his oꝝene gost yreaued and benome. and ayen yueld of his oꝝene ase he dede þe apostles at *lokes*” (p. 143).

“Þise virtue god ȝefþ to his sergons huanne he his wile maki kniȝtes as he dede to his apostles at *lokes*” (p. 163).

<sup>1</sup> The substance of this paper was read in the Modern Language Conference of Harvard University, December 1, 1890.

<sup>2</sup> *The Religious Poems of William de Shoreham*, ed. Th. Wright, pp. 117 ff.; also in Mätzner's *Allengl. Sprachproben*, I, i, 260 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Mätzner, I, i, 265. Since this paper was written the eleventh part of Mätzner's *Wörterbuch* has appeared. The entry under *loksounday* is: “*loksounday* s. vgl. *lokes*. Pfingstsonntag. Al here joyen a *loksounday*. . . . To thyssere loungy schelle. SHOREH. p. 127.” In a note, Mätzner adds: “In den Sprachproben hielt ich irrthümlich eine Verbesserung nöthig, da mir *lokes* noch nicht bekannt war.” Under *lokes* is the following: “*lokes* s. pl. ist es die Mehrzahl von *lac*, *lok* mit Bezug auf Festgaben und Festopfer gebraucht? vgl. *loksounday*. Pfingsten.” Then follow the three passages from the *Ayenbite*. The possibility of deriving *lokes* and *lok Sounday* from A. S. *lōc*, with its numerous meanings, was, in common with other possibilities, considered, but was rejected for reasons which appear below. It may be added here that the spelling *lokes* does not by any means prove that the *o* is long, for Michel spells the pl. of *loc*, clausura, sera, *lokes*; cf. the quotation given by Mätzner s.v. *loc*.

<sup>4</sup> *Dan Michel's Ayenbite of Inwyte*, ed. R. Morris, London, 1866.

"At *lokes* hou he zente þane holy gost ope his apostles" (p. 213).

It is a little surprising that Morris, knowing the *Ayenbite* to be a close translation of a popular French work<sup>1</sup> by Frère Lorens<sup>2</sup> (Laurentius Gallus), has not quoted the French originals of these interesting passages. Fortunately the recent publication of a part of the French text<sup>3</sup> enables us to supply this deficiency for two of the passages:—

"Car Dieu li a le sien Esperit ravi e tolu e raempli du sien, com il fist les apostres a *Penthecouste*" (p. 53, c. 37).

"Ceste vertu Dieu done a ses serjanz, quant il les daigne fere chevaliers, si com il fist ses apostres a *Penthecouste*" (p. 69, c. 48).

In each of these cases *lokes* translates *Penthecouste*. It is therefore clear that *lokes* not only means Pentecost, but was a popular term for it in Kentish of the fourteenth century, for Michel expressly states that he writes for the unlearned who know no language but English,<sup>4</sup> and he shows his anxiety to be understood by translating such words as *sorquidance* (p. 21), *solitude* (p. 142), *compassion* (p. 157), *satisfaction* (p. 180), *recité* (p. 193).<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The titles of it given by Morris are: *Le somme des Vices et de Vertues; Li livres roiaux de Vices et de Vertus; Le livre des Commandemens; La somme le roi; Le miroir du monde.*

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Goldbeck's criticism of Morris's account of Frère Lorens in Mätzner, I, ii, 58.

<sup>3</sup> Robert W. Evers, *Beiträge zur Erklärung und Textkritik von Dan Michel's Ayenbite of Inwyt*, Erlangen, 1888. Here is printed the French text corresponding to Morris, pp. 70–163, excluding the Pater Noster (pp. 98–118). The first seventy pages were printed by Varnhagen, *Englische Studien*, I, 379–423, and the Pater Noster, II, 27–59.

<sup>4</sup> "þis boc is ywrite uor englishe men, þet hi wyte hou hi ssolle ham-zelue ssriue, and maki ham klene ine þise liue." þe uore-speche, p. 5.

"Nou ich wille þet ye ywrite hou hit is ywent:  
þet þis boc is y-write mid engliss of Kent,  
þis boc is y-mad uor lewede men  
Vor uader and uor moder and uor oþer ken  
ham uor to berþe uram alle manyere zen  
þet ine hare inwyte ne bleue no uoul wen."—p. 262.

<sup>5</sup> Evers, *Einleitung*.

In the second edition of Stratmann's Dictionary we read under *lök*, "visus": —

"? lōksonnday, *dies festi pentecostes*, Shoreham, p. 127."

In the third edition the article was transferred to *loc*, "clausura, sera," and so it remains in the new edition by Bradley (Oxford, 1891). That Morris and Stratmann were right in connecting *lok Sounday*<sup>1</sup> with *lokes*<sup>2</sup> will appear from the following considerations: —

The stanza in which *lok Sounday* occurs expressly states that the day in question lies between the Ascension of Christ and the Assumption of Mary: —

"Al here joyen a *lok Sounday*,  
And alle the that men aspye may,  
That hyre an erthe felle,  
Al fram Chrystes ascensioun,  
Alwat comthe hyre assumpcioun,  
To thyssere loungy schelle."

Now Pentecost was certainly the most important day in Mary's life between these two events. It was at Pentecost that the Holy Spirit descended upon the disciples, and universal tradition reports that Mary was present with them. The *York Mystery Plays*<sup>3</sup> make her

---

<sup>1</sup> Bradley spells the word *lok Sonn(e)day*, which is better etymologically and metrically, but I have thought it best to retain the spelling given in Wright's text.

<sup>2</sup> Perhaps Stratmann's name should not appear in this sentence. He nowhere records *lokes* (= Pentecost); and it may be that the position of *lok Sounday* in his third edition merely indicates a change of opinion in regard to the length of the vowel in *lok*.

<sup>3</sup> *York Mystery Plays*, ed. Lucy Toulmin Smith, pp. 465 ff., especially p. 468. The Towneley (or Woodkirk) collection contains no play on this subject, there being a lacuna in the MS. In the Coventry collection there is a play, but it occupies only a page and a half, and is clearly fragmentary. The Chester collection contains a Pentecost play in which Mary does not appear. Do not the lacuna in the Towneley collection, the fragmentary character of this particular play in the Coventry collection, and the absence of any play on the Assumption from the Chester collection (together with the omission of Mary from the Pentecostal group), suggest a probable revision of these collections in the interest of Protestantism? The revision does not seem to have been entirely successful, but I think there are many other traces of such an attempt.



the most important member of the Pentecostal group ; not only does her name stand first in the list of *dramatis personæ* of the pageant of the Descent of the Holy Spirit, but the greater part of the dialogue is assigned to her ; and after the reception of the tongues of flame, it is she who begins the song of praise. Mediæval Art also gave her the most prominent position in the Pentecostal group. In a Roman Missal<sup>1</sup> published at Antwerp in 1627 there is a picture of the disciples in a room at the upper end of which Mary, elevated on a dais, sits with folded hands and uplifted eyes, while the tongues of flame, proceeding from a dove, descend on the disciples and her. Another picture representing Mary seated in the centre of the room, with hands uplifted, is given facing p. 317 of *Le Petit Paroissien* (Paris, 1809).<sup>2</sup> Mrs. Jameson<sup>3</sup> says : —

“She is usually placed either in front or in the centre, on a raised seat or dais ; and often holding a book<sup>4</sup> (as the Mater Sapientiæ) ; and she receives the divine effusion either with veiled lids and meek rejoicing ; or with uplifted eyes, as one inspired, she pours forth the hymn,<sup>5</sup> *Veni Sancte Spiritus*.”

Such being the case, it would be strange indeed if no mention were made of this event in the catalogue of joys ; but unless *lok Sunday* of this poem is identical with *lokes* of the *Ayenbite*, the reception of the Holy Spirit is passed over without a word. This fact, taken in connection with the passages in the *Ayenbite*, makes it, I think, perfectly certain that *lok Sunday* means Whitsunday.

The etymology of *lok Sunday* and *lokes* has only to be suggested

<sup>1</sup> *Missale Romanum*, Antwerp, 1627. I owe this reference and many others to Professor W. H. Carruth, of the University of Kansas, who began the investigation with me. His notes are marked W. H. C., but they do not represent his contribution to the solution of the problem, for many notes that are omitted here were of the utmost value to me in reaching my conclusions.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. also the woodcut, after a painting by H. Hemmelinck, at p. 303 of Mrs. Jameson's *Legends of the Madonna as represented in the Fine Arts*. Another picture, differing from these in detail, but of the same general character, is given facing the service for Dominica Pentecostes in *Missale Romanum*, Monachii, 1675. The dove appears in all three of these pictures.

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 304. Cf. also *A Handbook of Legendary and Mythological Art*, by Clara Erskine Clement, p. 198.

<sup>4</sup> So in the Munich Missal mentioned in note 2, above.

<sup>5</sup> More accurately, the sequence.

to be recognized as certain ; of the process by which they came to mean Whitsunday I can offer only a probable (but, I think, a highly probable) account.

*Lok* and *lokes* are certainly derived from Anglo-Saxon *loc*,<sup>1</sup> a lock, an enclosure, a conclusion, etc. This appears most clearly by comparison with the cognate expressions in Dutch. The great Middle Dutch dictionary<sup>2</sup> of Verwijs and Verdam gives : —

“Beloken cinxene, *die Zondag na Pinksteren, de octaaf van Pinksteren*, waarop de kerkelijke viering van het feest beloken wordt. || Des dinxendaghes na *beloken cinxen*, Oorkb.<sup>3</sup> 2. 493 b.”<sup>4</sup> “Beloken,<sup>5</sup> bnw. : eig. deelw. van het ww. beluken (zie ald.). 1.) In de uitdr. *beloken (bloken) paesschen en sinxen (pinxten)* eig. *het gesloten paasch- en pinkster-feest, de octaaf van den zondag na P.* [sic], waarop de kerkelijke viering van het Paasch- en Pinkster-feest gesloten wordt. . . . Nader Octave van Paesschen, dat men heet *Beloken Paeschen*, Dingt. van Delft,<sup>6</sup> 22. Des maendaegs . . . na den *belokenen Paeschedach*, Brab. Y.<sup>7</sup> vii, 9991. (ook Mandeville,<sup>8</sup> 23 a).

<sup>1</sup> Bosworth-Toller, s.v. It is probable that the real course of descent is through the Middle-English verb *locken*, which, coined from the noun *loc*, had taken the place of *lican*.

<sup>2</sup> *Mittelnederlandsch Woordenboek* van wijlen Dr. E. Verwijs en Dr. J. Verdam, 's Gravenhage, 1885—.

<sup>3</sup> *Oorkondenboek van Holland en Leeland*, uitg. door L. Ph. C. van den Bergh, 2 dln., 1866.

<sup>4</sup> *Mnl. Woordenb.*, s.v. *Cinxendach*.

<sup>5</sup> *ib.*, s.v. *Beloken*.

<sup>6</sup> *Dingtalen van Delft*, uitg. in *N. Bijdr. voor R. en Wetg.*, Dl. 4, 1878.

<sup>7</sup> *De Brabantsche Yeesten of Rijmchroniek van Brabant* door Jan Boendale van Antwerpen. 2 dln. uitg. door J. F. Willems, 1839 en 43; 3<sup>e</sup> dl. (7<sup>e</sup> boek) uitg. door J. H. Bormans, 1869 (in *Collection de Chroniques belges inédites*, publiées par ordre du gouvernement).

<sup>8</sup> *Mittelnederlandsch Bewerking der reis van Sir John Mandeville*, perkamenten Hs. in de Universiteits-bibliotheek te Leiden (N<sup>o</sup>. 14 f). The passage, as quoted further on by Verwijs and Verdam, is: “Daer openbaerde onse here sine apostelen eerst doe hi verresen was vander doot opten *blokenpaeschedach*, doe hi tot hem seide: ‘pax vobis.’” *Blokenpaeschedach* is, of course, a mistake. The three evangelists who mention the event agree in putting it on the very day of the Resurrection, not on the Sunday following; cf. John xx, 19; Luke xxiv, 36; Mark xvi, 14. The corresponding passage in the English version of Mandeville (ed. of 1725, p. 111; cf. Ashton's ed., p. 68, and Halliwell's, p. 92) is: “And

Opten *Belokenen Paeschedach*, id. 12288. Dat men thuwelic ende de feeste houden soude . . . te *belokenen Paesschen*. Vl. Rijmk.<sup>1</sup> 8735. Tsaterdages binnen *beloken chinxen*, Rek. van Zeel.<sup>2</sup> 2, 284; vgl. 394 waar men '*beloken pinkstren*' laest, evenals R. v. Utr.<sup>3</sup> I, 312, 185. Des Dinxedages na *belokenne Sinxen*, Priv. v. Brielle,<sup>4</sup> 2, 23. Twisken dit ende *beloken pinxter*, Leid. Keurb.<sup>5</sup> 127, 2. Men sel alle jaer die vreden vernuwen tot vier tijden von den jair, det sel wesen (o.a.) upten *beloken paeschedach*, Leid. Keurb. 218, 30. Up den *Belokenen Sinxendach* soe hadden uut gheweest eenighe gesellen van Gendt, Cron. v. Vlaend.<sup>6</sup> 2, 183. Sdinxdaghes na den *beloken Pinxterdach*,

there appered first oure Lord to his Disciples, afre his Resurrexioun, *the Zates enclosed*, and seyde to hem: *Pax vobis*: that is to seye; Pees to Zou." Is it possible that the *enclosed* of the English version is, in some way, directly or indirectly, the cause of the mistake? Cf., however, the following passage from the Breviary (*Breviarium monasticum*, etc., Typis Monasterii B. V. Mariæ Einsidensis 1756. Pars Vernalis, p. 323, Lectio xij s.v. Dominica in Albis): "Dixit eis Pax vobis. Sicut misit me Pater, et ego mitto vos," etc., which seems to indicate that general tradition put this event on the Sunday after Easter. The Miracle Plays, however, put it (usually in connection with the walk to Emmaus) on the day of the Resurrection; cf. *Chester Plays*, No. XIX, *Towneley*, No. XXV, *Coventry*, Nos. XXXVIII and XXXIX, *York*, XLI; Du Ménil, *Origines Latines du Théâtre Moderne*, pp. 120-126; and Milchsack, *Die lateinischen Oster- und Passionsspiele*, I, 102. It may be noted that the Danish translation of Mandeville renders the passage correctly: "ok vdy ten sammæ stæd jn kom Ihesus at lucte dýra effter sin opstønnelssæ til sinæ discipulis oc sadæ: 'Freth met cder.'" *Mandevilles Rejse i Gammeldansk Oversættelse*, . . . udgiven af M. Lorenzen, Kjøbenhavn, 1882, p. 48. The French original runs, "La apparust primerement nostre Seignur a ses deciples apres sa resurreccioun as portes closes et lour dit, *Pax vobis*." *The Buke of John Maundeuill*, ed. Roxburghe Club, 1889.

<sup>1</sup> Rijmkroniek van Vlaanderen, uitg. door E. Kausler in *Denkmäler altniederl. Sprache und Literatur*, Dl. 1.

<sup>2</sup> De rekeningen der Grafelijkheid van Zeeland, uitg. door H. G. Hamaker, in *Werken van het Hist. Genootschap te Utrecht*, N. Serie, No. 29 en 30.

<sup>3</sup> Rechtsbronnen der stad Utrecht, uitg. door S. Muller Fz. in *Oude Vaderlandsche Rechtsbronnen*, 2 dln. 1881.

<sup>4</sup> Privilegiën, Octroyen, enz. van de stad Briele en den lande van Voorn, in Alkemade en Van der Schelling, *Beschrijving van de stad Briele*, Dl. 2.

<sup>5</sup> De Middeeuwsche Keurboeken van de stad Leiden, uitg. door H. G. Hamaker, 1873.

<sup>6</sup> Kronyk van Vlaenderen van 580 tot 1467, 2 dln. uitg. door de Vlaemsche Bibliophilen, 1839.



Oorl. v. Albr.<sup>1</sup> 150. Des woensdaghes na *beloken Pinxter*, Hs. in de Bibl. van de M<sup>ij</sup>. der Ned. Lett. (Nieuwe Catalogue N<sup>o</sup>. 250) f. 38 d. Dat sy te wercken gaen soelen te Paeschen, te *bloken Paeschavonde*, te Sinxene, te *bloken Sinxenavonde*, ende te Kersavonde, te Dertienavonde ende niet eer, Belg. Mus.<sup>2</sup> 4, 78. So dat opten *beloken Paeschedach* . . . de gemeente weder quam ter merct, Exc. Cron.<sup>3</sup> 167 a. Smaendachs na *beloken paesschen*, Brab. Y., dl. 1, bl. 782. Saterdachs up den *Beloken Sinxen-avont* quam te Gent mare, enz., Cron. v. Vlaend. 2, 145."

To these may be added the following authorities, of various values : van Kiel,<sup>4</sup> Van de Velde en Sleeckx,<sup>5</sup> Blussé,<sup>6</sup> the abbé Olinger,<sup>7</sup> Winkelman,<sup>8</sup> Holtrop,<sup>9</sup> and Hexham<sup>10</sup>; and there is a note in *Mnl. Woordenb.*<sup>11</sup> to the effect that *beloken Paeschen* is still in use.

These quotations alone of course prove nothing, except that there

<sup>1</sup> De Oorlogen van Hertog Albrecht van Beieren met de Friezen, uitg. door E. Verwijs, in *Werken uitg. door het Hist. Genootschap te Utrecht*, N. Reeks, N<sup>o</sup>. 8.

<sup>2</sup> Belgisch Museum voor de Nederduitsche Taal- en Letterk. en de Gesch. des Vaderlandes, uitg. door J. F. Willems, 10 dln., 1837-46.

<sup>3</sup> Van Brabant die excellente Cronike, Antwerpen, bij Jan van Doesborch, 1530.

<sup>4</sup> *Etymologicum Teutonicæ Linguae*, 1777: "*beloken paesschen*. Pascha conclusum, p. absolutum, octava paschæ, quasimodo, dominica in albis; ultimus dies clausi temporis *apud Eccles.*"; also *Kilianus Auctus seu Dictionarium Teutonico-Latino-Gallicum*, 1642: "*beloken paesschen*. le Dimanche de Quasimodo."

<sup>5</sup> *Volledig Nederduitsch-Fransch Woordenboek*. Door Van de Velde en Sleeckx, 2d ed. 1861: "*Beloken paschen*, Pâques-closes."

<sup>6</sup> *Dictionnaire portatif François et Hollandois*, publié par Abraham Blussé, le jeune. Vol. II, 2d ed. 1815: "*Beloken Paaschen*, Pâques-closes."

<sup>7</sup> *Nouveau Dictionnaire Français-Flamand*, par M. l'abbé Olinger, 1859: "Pâques closes, *Beloken paschen*."

<sup>8</sup> *Nederduitsch en Fransch Woordenboek*. Door O. R. F. W. Winkelman, 1783: "*beloken Paaschen*, Pâques-closes, la Quasimodo."

<sup>9</sup> *Nieuw Nederduitsch en Engelsch Woorden-boek*. Door Johannes Holtrop. Vol. II, 1801: "*belookten paaschen*, the first sunday after easter."

<sup>10</sup> Henry Hexham, *Het Groot Woordenboek*, 1660: "*beloken*, locked or Shut up. *beloken Paesschen*, A close Easter."

<sup>11</sup> "Nog in het Oosten van ons land in gebruik in den vorm *Blokken paschen*." *Op. cit.*, Aanm. s.v. *beloken*. Cf. also Addis and Arnold, *A Catholic Dictionary*, 3d ed., s.v. *Low Sunday*: "Another Latin name, 'Pascha clausum,' is preserved in the Dutch name 'Beloken Paschen,' i.e. 'close of Easter.'" — W. H. C.



existed in Middle-Dutch<sup>1</sup> (and still exist in modern Dutch) two expressions similar in form and etymology to *lokes* and *lok Sunday*. Unfortunately neither of them means Whitsunday. But putting aside that difficulty for the present, let us pursue our inquiry further.

In some of the definitions quoted above *beloken Paeschen* was explained by *Pâques closes*, the ordinary French name for the Sunday after Easter,<sup>2</sup> our Low Sunday. Of the French name several different forms occur, as the following quotations from various dictionaries will show :—

Godefroy (*Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue française*) has : "1. Clos, clus, adj., est employé dans la loc. *Pasques closes* : Lo venredi apres Paques *cluses*. (Vend. apr. pâq. clos, 1284, *Ch. des compt. de Dole*,  $\frac{A}{60}$ , Arbois, Arch. Doubs.) La voille de Paisques *clusses*. (3 févr. 1291, Arch. mun. Besanç., reg. mun. 1, f° 25 v°.) Au me[r]credi d'ampres Pasques *cluses*. (1296, *Rentes d'Orliens*, Arch. Loiret, f° 91 v°.) — De même *closes pasques* : Samedi apres *cluses* Pasques. (1287, *Ch. du vic. de Boy.*, Aulnay, coté 253, Arch. Calv.) — De même au sing., *la close pasque* : Tres le *close* Pasque. (*Règle de Clteaux*, ms. Dijon, f° 33 r°.) La frenche feste de saint Quentin soloit commencer a la *close* Pasque. (1328, *Cop. des chart. des R. de Franche*, p. 100, Arch. S.-Quentin.) Et fist son mandement a Toulouse a estre a la *close* pasques. (Froiss., *Chron.*, III, 115, Kerv.)"

Ducange<sup>3</sup> (s.v. *Pascha Clausum*) has : "Statutum primum Westmonasteriense dicitur editum ann. 3 Edwardi I. Regis Angl. Lendemain de la *cluse* de Pasche. Tabular Calense : Le merquedy apres Pasques *cluses* l'an de grace 1326." To these Carpentier<sup>4</sup> adds :

<sup>1</sup> I have attempted no distinction between the various dialects.

<sup>2</sup> Cotgrave's definition of it as "Rogation Sunday" can only be explained as a mistake. The revision of Cotgrave by Howell (London, 1673) contains the same error.

<sup>3</sup> *Glossarium ad scriptores mediæ et infimæ Latinitatis*, Paris, 1734. When I made this note I was unable to get at the latest edition of Ducange, which would have saved me the trouble of quoting separately some of the dictionaries mentioned below.

<sup>4</sup> *Glossarium novum seu supplementum ad auctiorem Glossarii Cangiani editionem*. Paris, 1766.

"Chartul. Godefr. dom. Asperim. fol. 4, v°. Données l'an de grace de Nostre Signour 1350, le jour de l'*escluse* de Pasques. Lit. remiss. an. 1395 in Reg. 148, Chartoph. reg. ch. 324. Le jour des *clores* Pasques, que l'en chante Quasimodo." La Curne de Sainte-Palaye<sup>1</sup> (in note s.v. *cloire*) quotes Ducange; s.v. *Pasques* he adds the following: "En ce temps eschurent Pasques si haut, que environ Pasques *clores* on eut l'entrée du Mois de Mai (Froiss. ed. Buchon, I, i, p. 194)." The smaller dictionaries give no quotations, but to those quoted above may be added Roquefort,<sup>2</sup> which has, "*Pasques closes* ou *cluses*, le premier<sup>3</sup> dimanche après Pâques, celui de Quasimodo. *L'Art de vérifier les dates*<sup>4</sup> (in the list of holy days) has, "Clausum Pascha, *Pâque close*, autrefois<sup>5</sup> la *close* des Pâques, le dimanche d'après Pâques, ou la *Quasimodo*."

The phrase is also found in Wallonian and Provençal; in the former in the form *Klöss Pâk*;<sup>6</sup> in the latter two forms are given, *Pascha clusa*<sup>7</sup> and *Pasco clauso*.<sup>8</sup>

Of the French phrase corresponding to *beloken sinxen* I have been able to find only two examples. La Curne de Sainte-Palaye (in note 2 on *cluse* s.v. *cloire*) quotes from *Partonopex*. v. 2143,<sup>9</sup> "Mais il atent l'arriere ban Qui vient a feste Saint Johan, Dont estoit *close*

<sup>1</sup> Dict. Hist. de l'ancien langage François, Niort et Paris, 1875-82.

<sup>2</sup> Glossaire de la langue romaine, Paris, 1808.

<sup>3</sup> Rondeau, *Nouveau Dict. François Allemand*, nouvelle edition par Auguste J. Buxtorf, Bâle, 1739, has "*Pâque clos*, der zweyte sonntag nach ostern" — an error of the same kind as Cotgrave's.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. also the same in Nicolas's *Chronology of History* and de Mas-Latrie's *Trésor de Chronologie*.

<sup>5</sup> Possibly it still lingers among the people. In *Les Vies des Saints et L'Histoire des Festes de l'Année* (Paris, 1701-3), Vol. IV, pt. 2, col. 61, the heading of a section is: "Dimanche de Quasimodo, dit 'in albis' parn<sup>ti</sup> les gens d'église, et *pasque-close* parmi le peuple."

<sup>6</sup> *Dict. Wallon Français*, par L. Remacle, 2d ed., Liège et Leipsig, s.v. *Klöss*. "Klöss Pâk: *Pâques close* [sic], le dimanche qui suit immédiatement celui de Paques."

<sup>7</sup> *Dict. Prov.-Fr.*, par S.-J. Honnorat, Digne, 1847: "*Pascha-clusa*. Se disait du premier dimanche après Pâques."

<sup>8</sup> *Dict. Prov.-Fr.*, par F. Mistral, Aix en Provence, 1886: "*Pasco clauso*, Pâque close, se disait autrefois du premier dimanche après Pâques."

<sup>9</sup> Also quoted in Favre's Ducange, vol. IX, *Glossaire Français*.

*Pentecouste.*" The other I find quoted by Wendelin Foerster in his edition of the *Chevalier au Lion*<sup>1</sup> from the unpublished romance, *Rigomer*:

"a closes (so) *pentecoste*

Tenra se cort quantiel q'il coste" (15920).

All these phrases are, of course, translations of the Latin *clausum Paschæ* (or *Pascha clausum*) and *clausum Pentecostes*. Examples of the former (in both forms) are very common. Ducange<sup>2</sup> has, "*Clausum Paschæ*, apud Grodegang. Metens. Episc. in *Regula Canonicorum* cap. 36, novæ edit. cap. 30. Gregorius Turon. lib. 9, cap. 44: "Eo anno post *clausum Pascha*, etc. Ita apud Alcuinum Epist. 1. ad Carolum M. de Ratione Septuagesimæ, Rabanum lib. 3 de Inst. Cleric. cap. 34. Giraldum lib. 1. de Hibern. expugn. cap. 39, etc." Brinckmeier<sup>3</sup> (s.v. *Pascha*): "*Pascha clausum*, der Sonntag nach Ostern, mit welchem die Osterfeier beschlossen wurde." So Forcellini<sup>4</sup> (s.v. *clausus* 4): "Translate. Sacrament. Gelasian. 1. 58. Post *clausum Paschæ*; h.e. finito tempore Paschali." To these I am able to add, as showing the use of the term in England, the following: "a festo Sancti Hylarii usque ad *clausum Pascha*";<sup>5</sup> "erunt apud Vizeliacum ad *clausum Pascha*";<sup>6</sup> "venirent Vizeliacum in *clauso Pascha*";<sup>6</sup> "Eodem die statuit dominus rex diem coronationis suæ apud Wintoniam in *clauso Paschæ*";<sup>7</sup> "convenient ad eum apud Wintoniam in crastino *clausi Paschæ*";<sup>7</sup> "et

<sup>1</sup> *Der Löwenritter (Yvain)* von Ch. von Troyes, hrsg. von Wendelin Foerster, Halle, 1887, p. 273, apropos of the rhyme in vv. 5-6.

<sup>2</sup> s.v. *Pascha Clausum*.

<sup>3</sup> Eduard Brinckmeier, *Glossarium Diplomaticum*, Gotha, 1855-63. Another form given by both Ducange and Brinckmeier is *Clausula Paschæ*, with a reference to S. Aug. *Serm. de Temp.* 244.

<sup>4</sup> Totius Latinitatis Lexicon, ed. Vincentius De-Vit., Prati, 1861.

<sup>5</sup> *Chronica Gervasii Cantuariensis*, ed. Stubbs, I, 247. The same passage is in Hoveden, II, 57.

<sup>6</sup> *Chron. Rogeri de Hoveden*, ed. Stubbs, III, 19. The same passages in *Gesta Regis Henr. II Benedicti Abbatis*, II, 92, 93.

<sup>7</sup> Hoveden, III, 247: "Septima decima die mensis Aprilis, *die Dominica in octavis Paschæ* . . . Ricardus rex Angliæ vestimentis regalibus indutus, coronam auream habens in capite, processit de thalamo suo coronatus," etc.

statim post *clausum Pascha* exarsit nefanda proditorum rabies";<sup>1</sup> "Itaque post *clausum Pascha*, ut supradictum est, exarsit nefanda proditorum rabies";<sup>2</sup> "Et die Martis proxima post *clausum Pascha*";<sup>3</sup> "infra *clausum Pascha*";<sup>4</sup> "illuc venit Dominica *clausi Paschæ*";<sup>5</sup> "Eodem tempore circa *clausum Paschæ*";<sup>5</sup> "Et statim post *clausum Pascha* obsedit Genzai et Marcillam et Gramvillam et Agenvillam";<sup>6</sup> "qui statim post *clausum Pascha* transfretaverunt inter Doveram et Witsant."<sup>7</sup>

Examples of *clausum Pentecostes* are very much less common. The only dictionaries in which I have found the phrase recorded are Spelman's<sup>8</sup> and Maigne D'Arnis's.<sup>9</sup> But my own collections furnish the following examples, and there must be plenty more in existence:<sup>10</sup> "Et in planitie de Scalona moram fecit usque ad Pentecosten; et

<sup>1</sup> *Gesta Regis Henrici II Benedicti Abbatis*, ed. Stubbs, I, 45.

<sup>2</sup> *Benedict*, I, 47.

<sup>3</sup> *Benedict*, I, 83.

<sup>4</sup> *Benedict*, I, 110 (in the Assize made at Clarendon, Jan. 25, 1176, and recorded at Northampton).

<sup>5</sup> *Benedict*, I, 159.

<sup>6</sup> *Benedict*, I, 213.

<sup>7</sup> *Benedict*, I, 337. See also *L'Art de vérifier les dates*, and Nicolas's *Chronology of History*, s.v. *Clausum Pascha* in list of holy days; also R. T. Hampson, *Medii Ævi Kalendarium*, 1841, s.v. *Dominica in Albis* and *Clausum Paschæ*.

<sup>8</sup> *Glossarium Archaiologicum*, authore Henrico Spelmanno, London, 1687: "*Clausum Paschæ*, seu *Pentecostes*, Hov. p. 549, l. 42." Not being able to come at the edition of Hoveden (?) used by Spelman, I could not verify this reference; but I presume it is to one of the examples that I quote below.

<sup>9</sup> *Lexicon Manuale* . . . par W. H. Maigne D'Arnis, Paris, 1859 (s.v. *Pentecoste*): "*Pentecostes clausum*, Trinitatis Dominica, interdum etiam Dominica secunda post Pentecosten." I presume the latter statement rests on the authority of *L'Art de vérifier les dates* (s.v. *Clausum Pentecostes* in list of holy days; cf. *Chronology of History* and *Trésor de Chronologie*): "On le voit cependant pris pour le ii dimanche après la Pentecôte dans la chronique de Benoît de Péterborough." This is probably a mistake; at least I have found no such instance in *Benedict*; see below, p. 100, n. 3.

<sup>10</sup> My own very limited acquaintance with the Latin written in England affords abundant proofs that it has never been properly used by compilers of dictionaries of mediæval Latin. Spelman seems to have done more than any one else; he often has words not recorded elsewhere. A systematic reading of the English chronicles would furnish a host of new, or rare, words.



*die clausi Pentecosten* equitavit apud le Darun. . . ." "Et rex die Lunæ post *clausum Pentecosten* obsedit le Darun, et die Veneris sequenti cepit eam per vim," etc.<sup>1</sup> "Et statim post *clausum Pentecosten* Aschetillus Mallore, constabularius Leicestræ, ivit cum militibus suis ad Norhamtoniam villam regis, et burgenses exierunt obviam eis cum militibus qui intus erant. Et commiserunt cum eis prælium,"<sup>2</sup> etc. So also in the "Assize made at Clarendon, Jan. 25, 1176, and afterwards recorded at Northampton": "Item, justitiæ capiant

---

<sup>1</sup> Hoveden, III, 180. In his note on this passage, and also in a note on the corresponding passage in the *Itinerarium Regis Ricardi* (p. 352), Bishop Stubbs says that Hoveden puts the expedition to Darum a week too late. Is it not, rather, two weeks too late? The language of the *Itinerarium* is: "His ita dispositis, rex, cum suis tantum domesticis, armatus profectus est ad castrum Darum, quo quadam Dominica pervenientes, non procul inde fixa sunt tentoria ipsius et comitum ejus" (p. 352). "Ipsi vero qui confugerant in turrim videntes suorum perditionem . . . se jam in extrema necessitate, *die Veneris ante Pentecosten*, exposuerunt regiæ clementiæ dedendos in perpetuam servitutem" (p. 355). "Nocte Sabbati sequentis, fecit rex suos Turcorum adhuc existentium in turri custodiam habere usque mane Sabbati. Igitur vigilia Pentecostes ad regis imperium descendentes a turri, Turci arctissimis usque ad rugitum constricti sunt loricis" (p. 355). "In castro Darum die magno festivitatis Pentecostes commorati sunt universi. Die Lunæ . . . profecti sunt versus Ascalonem, per mediam Gazam transeuntes usque Furbiam, ubi rex tribus sedit diebus. Cæteri vero usque Ascalonem profecti sunt, ubi Franci festivitatem Pentecostes solemnizabant." This account, says Bishop Stubbs, is consistent, and agrees with that of Bohadin, p. 227. Now the first date that is given with any definiteness in the *Itinerarium* is "*die Veneris ante Pentecosten*," which I take to be really the date meant by "*die Veneris sequenti*" in Hoveden. If this be true, there is a discrepancy of two weeks, for that is the interval between the Friday before Pentecost and the Friday after *clausum Pentecosten*—unless, indeed, we suppose that by *clausum Pentecosten* Hoveden (and Bishop Stubbs) understood Pentecost itself. It is perhaps worthy of note in this connection that Riley, in the Bohn edition of Hoveden, translates *clausum Pentecosten* by "the last day of Pentecost" and "the close of Pentecost." The whole passage runs, "He made a stay on the plains of Ascalon until Pentecost, and, on the last day of Pentecost, rode to Le Darum," etc. "On the Monday after the close of Pentecost he laid siege to Le Darum, and on the Friday following took it by storm" (II, 266).

<sup>2</sup> Benedict, I, 68. The corresponding passage in Hoveden runs, "*Post Pentecosten* Anketillus Mallore, constabularius Leicestræ commisso prælio cum burgensibus de Northamtun, et eos confecit, et ex illis plusquam ducentos cepit, et quamplures interfecit (II, 57).

domini regis fidelitates infra clausum Pascha, et ad ultimum infra *clausum Pentecosten*,"<sup>1</sup> etc.

"Eodem anno circa *clausum Pentecosten*, Margareta, quæ, ut supra dictum est, prægnans abiit ad regem Franciæ patrem suum, peperit filium, et vocatus est nomen ejus Willelmus, sed infra triduum obiit Parisius ubi natus fuit; et quidam dicebant quod abortivus fuit.

"Interim, die Dominica *clausi Pentecosten*, scilicet decimo tertio Kalendas Julii, et festo Sanctorum Gervasii et Prothasii martyrum, sanguineus imber cecidit in insula de With, fere per duas horas integras."<sup>2</sup>

"Quod ipsi audientes noluerunt iram præfati regis Angliæ incurere; sed beatum corpus illud [of St. Petroc] reddiderunt prænominato Rogero priori Bothmeniæ, die Dominica *clausi Pentecosten*, festo scilicet Sanctorum Gervasii et Prothasii martyrum, scilicet xiii Kalendas Julii."<sup>3</sup>

These quotations seem to prove that *clausum Pentecosten* was a term fairly well understood in certain parts of England, and that it meant the Sunday after Pentecost. The addition of "die" and "die Dominica" in three of the examples does, indeed, suggest that possibly *clausum* had come to be applied to the whole week following Whitsunday, but I know of no other evidence of such an extension of meaning.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Benedict, I, 110; Hoveden, II, 90.

<sup>2</sup> Benedict, I, 177. Hoveden (II, 136) gives no date for Margaret's journey, but says, "Eodem anno decimo tertio Kalendas Julii, pluit in insula Vectæ sanguineus imber fere per duas horas integras."

<sup>3</sup> Benedict, I, 179. Hoveden (II, 136) gives no date. In view of the great accuracy of these dates, it seems incredible that this chronicle contains such an error in regard to *clausum Pentecosten* as that attributed to it by *L'Art de vérifier les dates* (see above, p. 98, n. 9). The variations between Benedict and Hoveden in regard to giving dates of events is a trifling circumstance which seems to support Bishop Stubbs's argument (Benedict, I, Pref. liv.) that the two chronicles are not from the same hand.

<sup>4</sup> Professor Carruth found in some German chronicle (a reference to which he unfortunately failed to take) the statement that by the Council of Arboga, in 1396, sexual intercourse was forbidden during the "geschlossene Periode." The words of the decree are, however: "Primo videlicet, quod *temporibus a jure prohibitis* nullus presbyterorum, sub poena privationis officii sui sacerdotalis, nup-

In spite of the fact that thus far the phrases containing *clausum* have none of them meant Whitsunday, the conclusion seems irresistible that *clausum* of *clausum Paschæ* and *clausum Pentecostes*, close of *Pâque close* and *Pentecoste close*, and *beloken* of *beloken Paesschen* and *beloken Sinxen* are really the same as *lok* in *lok Sounday* and *lokes*. If it could be shown that, at any time, *clausum Pentecostes* came to mean Whitsunday instead of the Sunday following, the proof would be a complete demonstration. Unfortunately I have been able to find no such proof; but I hope to be able to show how such a change may have been brought about, and thus, to some extent, to remove any objections that may still remain against the identification of *lok Sounday* with *clausum Pentecostes*.

Writers on ecclesiastical history seem agreed that in early times the whole week following Pentecost was celebrated, and that the Sunday following held the same relation to that festival that Low Sunday held to Easter. Blunt<sup>1</sup> says, "The entire octave was celebrated in early days and followed by a week of fasting" (Con. Ap. V, 33). Augusti<sup>2</sup> says, "Bey der Organization des christlichen Cultus im vierten Jahrhundert wurden die jüdischen Octaven der beiden Haupt-Feste, Ostern und Pfingsten, aufgenommen." Bingham,<sup>3</sup> "This festival of Pentecost in particular was observed the whole week after till the Octaves, or Sunday following, without fasting or kneeling, and then the church returned to her usual stationary fasts on *Wednesdays* and *Fridays*, and in some places a strict fast all the week succeeded this festival, as we learn from the second Synod

---

tias solepnizare ac celebrare, seu benedicere audeat. . . . Prohibemus etiam sub interminatione maledictionis æternæ, nequis laicorum cujuscumque præeminentiæ, dignitatis, conditionis aut status existat, se in facie ecclesiæ, ad aliquas septimanas seu dies, *ante dicta tempora a jure prohibita*, cum desponsata sua benedici faciat ad finem quod postmodum expensas, seu solempnitates nuptiarum cum carnis copula in ipsis *prohibitis temporibus* peragat quoque jure," etc. Conc. Arbogense, in Supp. to Labbe, tom. III. col. 707. Apparently "geschlossene" means here no more than "a jure prohibitis"; but cf. the definition of *beloken Paesschen* by van Kiel in his *Etymologicum Teutonicæ Lingvæ* as, "ultimus dies *clausi temporis*," p. 94, n. 4.

<sup>1</sup> Dict. of Doctr. and Hist. Theol., p. 561.

<sup>2</sup> Denkwürdigkeiten aus der christlichen Archäologie, I, 137.

<sup>3</sup> Origines Ecclesiasticæ, XX, vii, 6.



of Tours.”<sup>1</sup> So Neudecker :<sup>2</sup> “Das wichtige Pfingstfest, als dessen Vorbereitungsfest die Himmelfahrt Jesu und die Pfingstvigilie betrachtet wird, feiert man in der catholischen kirche auch durch eine Nachfeier, durch die Pfingstoctave.”

But the very term *clausum Pentecostes* is itself sufficient proof that the Sunday following Pentecost was regarded only as the octave<sup>3</sup> of that festival and as such received its name, *clausum Pentecostes*.

Meanwhile the doctrine of the Trinity was coming into greater prominence in the Church. As early as the latter part of the eighth (or the beginning of the ninth) century, Alcuin is said<sup>4</sup> to have wished

<sup>1</sup> “De Pascha usque Quinquagesimam, exceptis Rogationibus, omni die prandium preparatur. Post Quinquagesimam tota Hebdomada exacte jejunetur.” *Conc. Turon.* 2, can. 18. But this seems to me to mean that the fast began immediately after Pentecost, not a week after; and so also does the second canon of the Council of Gironne: “Ut expleta solemnitate Pentecostes, in sequenti septimana, a quinta feria in Sabbatum, per hoc triduum abstinencia celebretur.” *Conc. Gerund.* can. 2.

<sup>2</sup> Allgemeines Lexicon der Religions- und christlichen Kirchengeschichte für alle Confessionen, 1834-47, s.v. *Pfingstoctave*.

<sup>3</sup> Krüll, in Kraus's *Real-Encyclopädie der chr. alterthümer*, s.v. *Octaven* says, “Die römischen Ordines kennen keine *octava Pentecostes*: die Pfingstfeier endigte sich in alter Zeit mit dem siebenten Tage, dem Samstage, und der darauf folgende Sonntag hiess in dem römischen Lectionarium: *Dominica prima post Octavas Pentecostes* oder *post Pentecosten*,” — which seems to be correct, for the white robes worn by the newly baptized seem to have been worn from Saturday to Saturday: “A sabbato enim usque ad sabbatum portantur albæ vestes,” etc. Amalarii *de eccl. officiis*, lib. I, cap. xxix. Cf. also I, xl. But the witness of *clausum Pentecostes* can hardly be set aside; and, moreover, the term *Octava Pentecostes* occurs frequently in the literature, thus Durandus (apud Augusti, II, 429), “In plerisque locis in *Octava Pentecostes* fit festum S. Trinitatis,” and “Sed in qualibet Dominica ab *octava Pentecostes*.” So also *Conc. Arelat.* an. 1260, can. 6: “Item statuimus etiam, ut in *octava Pentecostes* celebretur solemniter officium Sanctæ Trinitatis.” Cf. also Gavanti *Thesaurus Sac. Rit.*, ed. 1646: “*Octavam* habet hoc festum ex institutione Apostolorum, *Baron. anno Domini* 58.” I, par. iv, tit. xi, 24, p. 278. Cf. also I, iv, xii, 1, p. 279, and II, sec. iii, cap. viii, i, p. 28. “An vero dies Octava Pentecostes dici debeat Sabbatum sequens, vel Dominica, disputat *Berno de Quibusdam* ad Missam spect. cap. 3, et concludit cum Catholica Ecclesia, octavam dici Dominicam sequentem, quam nos Festum Trinitatis: sed tamen tempus Paschale terminatur in Nona Sabbati, *ex Ord. Roman.*, Beda et Alcuino locis citatis [*i.e.* Beda in Hom. de Septem hebdom., and Alcuinus de Septem diebus].” Id., I, iv, xi, 27, p. 279.

<sup>4</sup> Durandus, *Rationale div. off.*, lib. vi, cap. 114, apud Augusti, II, 425.



to establish a festival in honor of the Trinity and even to have composed those parts of the ritual which now serve as the *Introitus Missæ*.<sup>1</sup> However this may be, the abbot Potho, in his *De Statu Domus Dei S. Ecclesiæ*<sup>2</sup> uses language which shows clearly that some churches had, in the middle of the twelfth century, begun to celebrate such a festival. His words are: "Miramur, quod nostro tempore nonnulli in Monasteriis novas celebritates inducant. Quare? an patribus sumus doctiores? Quæ igitur ratio celebrandi festum Trinitatis et Transfigurationis Christi?" But the general observance of it in the Western Church dates from a much later period. According to Gavantus,<sup>3</sup> Augusti,<sup>4</sup> Krüll,<sup>5</sup> and Schaff-Herzog,<sup>6</sup> it is to be

<sup>1</sup> Augusti (II, 426, 3), says, however, "Er wollte bloss eine allgemeine, für jeden Sonn- oder Fest-tag passende *Confessio S. Trinitatis* liefern welche man in spätern Zeiten für diesen Tag auswählte.

<sup>2</sup> Apud Augusti, II, 427.

<sup>3</sup> Dicitur auctor Festi Trinitatis Gregorius IV [but cf. n. 4] ab auctore Lignivite lib. 5. *Pisanelle* facit auctorem Ioannem XXII ver. *Feria* § 3. Gavanti *Thesaurus*, tom. I, pt. IV, tit. 12, p. 280.

<sup>4</sup> Bey so bestimmten Zeugnissen aus dem zwölften Jahrhundert [*i.e.* the quotation from Potho and the decretals of Alexander III in Conc. Lat. an. 1179] kann weder die Meynung derjenigen, welche Papst Gregorius IV im Jahr 834 zum Urheber dieses Festes machen, noch die Behauptung, dass eine Synode zu Arles im Jahr 1260 diese Feyer allgemein geordnet habe, vertheidiget werden. Selbst der gelehrte Cardinal *Prosper. Lambertini* (als Papst Benedict XIV) wagt in seiner Schrift: *De festis Domini nostri Jesu Christi*, etc. lib. I, c. 12, § 10, nicht mehr zu behaupten, als dass man die allgemeine Feyer des Pfingst-octave, als Trinitäts-Fest, nicht früher als in's Jahr 1334, wo Papst Johann XXIII [*sic*] dieselbe verordnet, annehmen könne. Dass auch der heilige Bernhard von Clairveaux keine Homilie auf dieses Fest hat, darf nicht übersehen werden, und wird in Verbindung mit anderen Umständen doch etwas mehr als ein bloss negativer Beweis." Augusti, II, 427 f. I take it that Augusti is here speaking only of the observance of the festival by the whole Western Church, and does not mean to assert that such a festival had not been established in some localities. The language of the Synod of Arles is clear: "Item statuimus etiam, ut in octava Pentecostes celebretur solemniter officium sanctæ Trinitatis, et a vespere Sabbati Dominica agatur solemnitas: et per totam sequentem hebdomadam tres lectiones et tria responsoria singulis diebus, nisi festum IX lectionum extiterit, de sanctæ Trinitatis historia per ordinem decantentur usque ad vespas sequentis Sabbati, et tunc incipiatur historia" (Can. vi). Of course the quotations from Potho and Alexander, being of the twelfth century, have no bearing on the interpretation of this canon.

<sup>5</sup> s.v. *Octaven* in Kraus's *Real-Encyclopädie*. Cf. also G. Moroni, *Dizionario di Erudizione Storico-ecclesiastico*, lxxx, 278 ff.

<sup>6</sup> s.v. *Trinity Sunday*. A part of this article seems to be incorrect: "Trinity Sunday . . . was introduced into the calendar by Benedict XI in 1305." But

assigned to the year 1334 and to Pope John XXII. Whatever date is to be accepted for its origin, it is at least certain that before the end of the fourteenth century its celebration had become general, and it was regarded as so important that it is often called *le Roi des Dimanches*.<sup>1</sup>

But it does not seem likely that so important a festival would have been established on a day already occupied by a festival that was generally observed. Are we not, then, justified in assuming that the octave of Pentecost was no longer generally celebrated as *clausum Pentecostes*? This assumption seems to be supported by what is known of the history of the Pentecostal festival.

In the first place, in spite of the fact that in the early Church the whole Pentecostal week was duly observed,<sup>2</sup> the Pentecostal period was often regarded as ending at Whitsunday.<sup>3</sup> Secondly, "from the

---

according to *L'Art de vérifier les dates* (vol. 3, p. 380), Benedict died July 6 or 7, 1304; the *Trésor de Chronologie* says July 7.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *L'Art de vérifier les dates*, the *Trésor de Chronologie*, or Nicolas's *Chronology of History*, s.v. *Dominica Sanctæ Trinitatis*.

<sup>2</sup> Per septem autem dies festum Pentecostes celebratur, ut auctor est Honorius Augustod. lib. 3, cap. 147 et 149. Ducange, s.v. *Pentecoste*. Cf. also Hebenstreit *de Pentecoste vet.*, p. 6, apud Augusti, II, 389. "Die siebentägige Feyer wurde erst nach der Aufhebung der *Quinquagesima* aus dem Judenthume eingeführt," Augusti, I, 171; *vid.* also p. 167, and cf. the quotation from Bingham at p. 101, above. "Die christlichen Kaiser zeichneten die Octaven von Ostern und Pfingsten durch bürgerliche Privilegien, z. B. durch Verbot der öffentlichen Schauspiele, durch Unterlassung der *actiones juridicae*, etc., aus (*Cod. Theod.* lib. XV, tit. 5, de quæst. leg. 7). In Deutschland wurde nach einen Conc. Mogunt. (813), c. 36 noch im 9 Jahrhundert die ganze Pfingstoctav auch im bürgerlichen Leben festtägig begangen." Krüll, in Kraus's *Real-Encykl.*, s.v. *Octaven*.

<sup>3</sup> "*Pentecoste*, intervallum a dominica Resurrectionis ad festum Pentecostes Græcis et Latinis scriptoribus passim etiam dicitur. *Ordo Romanus*: 'Tempus autem Pentecostes inchoatur a prima die Resurrectionis; et currit usque ad diem quinquagesimum post Pascha.'" Ducange, s.v. *Pentecoste*. The passage from the *Ordo Romanus* is also given (with the omission of *autem*, and with no reference) in Amalarii *de eccl. officiis*, lib. I, cap. xxxvi. "Quinquaginta dies post Pascha Domini, hoc est, totum tempus Pentecostes, figurant illam lætitiâ, quæ erit in alia vita," etc. Amal. *de eccl. Offic.* IV, xxix. "Dicit Ambrosius in tractatu super Lucam: 'Majores nobis tradidere, Pentecostes omnes quinquaginta dies ut Paschæ celebrandos'" Id. IV, xlvi. The well-known passages in Tertullian (*de Idolat.* 14; *de Bapt.* 19), Chrysost. (*Hom.* 63, *Cur in Pentecoste Acta legantur*),

eighth century down, these festivals [of the Pentecostal week] began to be curtailed.<sup>1</sup> Augusti<sup>2</sup> gives no earlier date than 1094; but his reference is to the action of the Council of Constance in that year, and the language<sup>3</sup> of the account of the council clearly indicates that the effect of its action was not to be a reduction of the festival days of the Pentecostal week, but an increase of them from one to four, and, consequently, that the observance of the whole week had ceased.

The decline of the celebration of the octave of Pentecost as *clausum Pentecostes* was perhaps helped on by the very splendor of the celebration of Pentecost itself. Occurring as it did in the late spring or early summer, and forming the close of the feasts of the Church year, it was natural that the day of Pentecost should be observed with peculiar interest, and that any lesser celebration a week later should seem inappropriate and undesirable. As the festival of the Holy Spirit, it had been made of especial importance<sup>4</sup> by the Church, and seems early to have been celebrated everywhere but in Spain.<sup>5</sup> The mediæval romances and ballads are full of great

---

Origen (*Contra Celsum*, viii, 22), Can. Apost. (c. 37), and Can. 20, Conc. Antioch. (an. 341) agree with this and corroborate it, but they do not seem to me sufficient alone to prove it (as is usually assumed; cf. Herzog, Schaff-Herzog, and Blunt, s.v. *Pentecoste*); they prove only that Pentecost was a long period, but whether it ended at Whitsunday or the octave of Whitsunday does not appear from them alone.

<sup>1</sup> Zöckler (G. H. Schodde), s.v. *Pentecoste* in Schaff-Herzog.

<sup>2</sup> Augusti, I, 171, and II, 389.

<sup>3</sup> Item statuit, ut tam in hebdomada Pentecostes, quam in hebdomada Paschali tres tantum dies festivi celebrarentur. Nam usque ad illud tempus Constantiensis episcopatus morem comprovincialium non est secutus, videlicet integram septimanam in Pascha, et unam tantum diem in Pentecoste observando; quamvis utræque septimanæ ejusdem observationis esse debuerint." *Conc. Const.* an. 1094. Cf. "Ut paschalis hebdomada festive tota celebretur, et in pentecosten secunda, tertia, quarta feria, non minus quam dies dominicus, solenniter honorentur." *Conc. Tolet.* IV, can. 75, an. 948.

<sup>4</sup> Post decimum vero diem ab ascensione, qui est Pentecoste, id est a prima dominica quinquagesimus, sit vobis maxime festus. *Const. Apost.* V, 19.

<sup>5</sup> "Pentecostes festum olim non in tota Hispania solitum fuisse celebrari, constat ex concilio Eliberitano [305?]; ubi, ut hujusmodi error corrigatur, ita cavetur cap. 43. *Pravam institutionem emendari placuit, juxta auctoritatem scripturarum, ut cuncti diem Pentecostes celebremus. Quod qui non fecerit, quasi novam hæresim induxisse novetur*" Nota Garsix Loaisæ in Labbe, vol. VII, col. 484.



feasts held at Pentecost. Professor Child gives a number of instances in his notes on *The Boy and the Mantle*; <sup>1</sup> others are given by Wendelin Foerster in his edition of Christian of Troyes's *Chevalier au Lion*; <sup>2</sup> and there are hundreds that have never been collected. No reader of mediæval literature can have failed to be impressed with the importance of the Pentecostal festival and the universality of its celebration by both high and low; moreover, many customs still remain in almost all Teutonic countries to attest its great popularity.

Is it then unlikely that Whitsunday came more and more to be regarded as the close of the Pentecostal period, and that the name *clausum Pentecostes* (being perhaps already, on account of its infrequent use, not well understood) <sup>3</sup> was transferred, at least in Kent, <sup>4</sup> to Whitsunday itself? *Lok* must represent *clausum*; a confusion in time must have taken place; and the considerations offered above seem to make the hypothesis as to the process of this confusion more than a merely possible hypothesis.

The similarity of the names *Whitsunday* and *Dominica in Albis* <sup>5</sup> suggests that *White Sunday* and *clausum Paschæ* were together trans-

<sup>1</sup> Ballads, pt. ii, p. 257.

<sup>2</sup> I am indebted to Professor Kittredge for two that have not been recorded: *Li Chevaliers as Deus Espées*, Foerster's ed., vv. 157-163; *Perceval le Gallois*, v. 3998 ff. Cf. *Ywain and Gawain*, ed. Schleich, vv. 16-17, and the numerous instances cited by Verwijs and Verdam (*Mnl. Woordenb.*), sub *Cinxene*, *Cinxen-avont*, *Cinxendach*, and also J. F. Willems's note on v. 1 of *Reinaert de Vos*, in his edition.

<sup>3</sup> In Matthew Paris's *Historia Angl.* the octave is mentioned immediately after a mention of Pentecost, but is not called *clausum Pentecostes*: "Eodem tempore rex Anglorum H[enricus], die Pentecostes Johannem, filium Huberti justiciarii, nimis fastigiose cingulo cinxit militari. . . . Consecrati sunt etiam cum eo [*i.e.* magister Ricardus Cant. electus] die eadem, per ministerium ejusdem episcopi, ante majus altare in ecclesia Sanctæ Trinitatis Cantuariæ, Rogerus, electus Londoniensis, et Hugo Elyensis, iiii<sup>o</sup> idus Junii." Ed. Madden, II, 318. It is to be noted that the year referred to is 1229, and that the book was finished in 1250.

<sup>4</sup> It will be remembered that both Shoreham and Michel lived in Kent. I suppose that I must give up my theory that Benedict's chronicle was also written there; Bishop Stubbs's argument seems unanswerable.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Minsheu's queer definition: "Whitsuntide, Dominica in Albis, Octava Paschæ, a candidis vestibus quibus veteres octo diebus a Sabbatho Paschæ usque ad Sabbathum sequens, solebant post baptismum." *The Guide into the Tongues*, London, 1617.



ferred from *Dominica in Albis* to Pentecost. But it is not clear that *Whitsunday* arose from any confusion with *Dominica in Albis*. It is true that *Dominica in Albis* may well be translated by *White Sunday*, and that in Germany<sup>1</sup> it was so translated, but *Dominica in Albis* does not seem to have been in very common use in England, where *Low Sunday* and *Clausum Paschæ* seem to have been preferred. Moreover, the name *Dominica in Albis* has reference to the putting off<sup>2</sup> of the white robes of the newly baptized after they had been worn the required seven days (or eight, as it was counted); whereas in spite of the testimony of Skinner<sup>3</sup> and Hampson,<sup>4</sup> there

<sup>1</sup> "Weisse Sonntag: 1) Der Sonntag Invocavit . . .

2) Der Sonntag Quasimodogeniti, sabbatum in albis, noch heute in Niedersachsen." Brinckmeier, *Gloss. Diplom.*

<sup>2</sup> "Paschalis solennitas hodierna festivitate concluditur, et ideo hodie Neophytorum habitus commutatur; ita tamen ut candor, qui de habitu deponitur, semper in corde teneatur." Aug. Hom. 86 *de Diversis*, in Octavis Paschæ, tom. 10, p. 709, apud Bingham, *op. cit.* XII, iv, 3; and also in the Benedictine Breviary of 1756, p. 321. "The eighth and last day in this second series was called the Octave of Easter, *Pascha Clausum*, ἀντὶπαῤῥα, *Dominica in Albis*, White Sunday [it is to be remembered that this is translated from the German], because those who had been baptized on the preceding 'Great Sabbath' (*i.e.* Saturday) (*Novi, Infantes*) now laid aside their white garments, and appeared with the rest of the church, after having been solemnly exhorted by the bishop to be faithful to their baptismal vows." Guericke, *Manual of Church History*, transl. by W. G. T. Shedd, p. 298. Cf. Addis and Arnold, *A Catholic Dict.*, s.v. *Low Sunday*.

<sup>3</sup> "Whitsuntide. The feast of Pentecost. [White and Sunday; because the converts newly baptized appeared from Easter to Whitsuntide in white.] Skinner in Johnson's Dict., ed. 1818.

<sup>4</sup> "The earliest day on which the movable feast of Pentecost can occur is May 10; by us it is popularly called *Whitsuntide*, the *Dominica Alba* of the Middle Ages, because the catechumens, newly baptized, appeared from Easter to Whitsuntide in white garments; hence *White Sunday*, Ags. hwita Sonndæȝ [*sic*]." *Medii Ævi Kalendarium*, I, 280. But Hampson is hardly to be trusted; for instance, he says (II, 87), "*Dominica in Albis*,—Low Sunday, which the Germans call *White Sunday* (Dresser, *de Fest. Diebus*, p. 66), and which is the Sunday after our *White Sunday*." [Italics mine.] At p. 84 of the same volume *Dominica Alba* is defined as "White Sunday or Whitsunday." He himself gives *Alba* (sub voc.) as "The week following Easter and Pentecost: thus Benedict of St. Peter's, before 1143, calls the interval from Easter day to the following Saturday 'Infra Albas Paschæ' (*Lib. Pollicit.* n. 52, p. 144), and Ducange says that the Octo dies Neophytorum are named 'Albas Pentecostes' in the Pœnitentials of Theodore, Archbishop of Canterbury, c. xviii"; which is hardly consistent with the laying aside of the robes at Whitsunday.

is apparently no reason for believing that the white robes were ever laid aside on Whitsunday. The rules of the Church are explicit in requiring them to be worn eight days,<sup>1</sup> and after the early ages, when, possibly, baptism was administered throughout the whole period from Easter to Pentecost,<sup>2</sup> the requirement is equally explicit that baptism (of adults) shall be administered only on the vigils of Easter and Pentecost.<sup>3</sup> Whitsunday, therefore, probably got its name, as Bingham,<sup>4</sup> Blackmore,<sup>5</sup> Nelson,<sup>6</sup> Vigfússon,<sup>7</sup> and Skeat<sup>8</sup> have suggested, from the fact that on that day the newly baptized appeared in white robes. This would seem to render unlikely any confusion of *Dominica in Albis* with *Whitsunday*, and consequently of *Clausum Paschæ* with *lok Sounday*.

It remains to account for the forms of *lok Sounday* and *lokes*. The former I take to be analogous, though not exactly similar, to *Whitsunday*, *Ash-Wednesday*, etc. *Lokes* is doubtless a plural, either translated from the French *closes* (which seems to have occurred oftener than *close*; cf. the mistake in the quotation from *Rigomer*, p. 97, above), or influenced by it.

JOHN M. MANLY.

<sup>1</sup> "A sabbato enim usque ad sabbatum portantur albæ vestes," etc. Amalarii *de eccl. officiis*, I, xxix.

<sup>2</sup> "Exinde Pentecoste ordinandis aquis latissimum spatium est, quo et Domini resurrectio inter discipulos frequentata est." Tertull. *de Baptismo*, c. 19, apud Augusti, VII, 167; but see Augusti's note.

<sup>3</sup> "Item juxta sanctorum patrum decreta, scilicet Innocentii Papæ, et Leonis, statuimus ne generale baptisma nisi sabbato Paschæ et Pentecostes fiat. Hoc quidem servato, quod parvulis, quocumque tempore, quocumque die petierint, regenerationis lavacrum non negetur. Vigilia vel die Epiphaniæ ut nullus, nisi infirmitatis necessitate, baptizetur, omnino interdiciamus." *Conc. Rotomagensis*, can. 24, anno 1072.

<sup>4</sup> Origines Eccl. XII, iv, 3; cf. XII, iv, 1.

<sup>5</sup> Apud Cave, *Prim. Christianity*, bk. I, ch. 7; Schaff-Herzog, s.v. *Pentecost*, and McClintock and Strong, VII, 930. The latter quote, with approval, from Blunt and Neale the derivation of *Whitsunday* from *Pentecost* through *Pfingsten*, the absurdity of which Skeat has so clearly shown.

<sup>6</sup> A Companion for the Festivals and Feasts of the Church of England [by Robert Nelson], 3d. ed., p. 215.

<sup>7</sup> Icelandic Dict., s.v. *Hvi'tasunnudagr*, with numerous references.

<sup>8</sup> Etymol. Dict, s.v. *Whitsunday*.

## HENRY SCOGAN.

PROFESSOR BRANDL devotes one section (§ 98) of his henceforth indispensable *Englische Literatur* (Paul's *Grundriss*, II, i, 684) to Henry Scogan. Since the present article is in the main a criticism of the suggestion therein made that Scogan may be the author of the pseudo-Chaucerian *Court of Love*, it will be convenient to quote the section almost entire.

"Scogan wird in einer launigen Epistel [*Lenvoy to Scogan*] des alten Chaucer als ein Dichter beschrieben, der ebenfalls grauhaarig, beleibt und gar nicht mehr nach Liebe angethan ist. Er hat einen so lästerlichen, übermüthigen, im Liebeskodex verbotenen Ausspruch Cupido selber in den Mund gelegt, dass Venus darüber in eine Thränenflut ausgebrochen ist — Anspielung auf die Wassernot von 1393. Er steht bei Hof in hoher Gunst, möge sie also für seinen vergessenen Freund Chaucer gebrauchen. Die Angaben passen auffallend auf den *Hof der Liebe*, eines der sog. unechten Chaucer-Epen: ein höchst obscönes Statut wird da vom Liebesgott vor versammeltem Hofstaat verkündet; wiederholt kommt der Dichter auf diesen Kapitalspass zurück; er selbst ist über die Jahre der Liebe hinaus; seine Beliebtheit bei Hof rückt er stark ins Licht. Auch dass Chaucer zu Ende seiner Epistel auf die Freundlichkeit des Tullius als Vorbild hinweist, hat da seinen guten Bezug; denn der *Hof der Liebe* beginnt mit einer Erwähnung der frischen (Rhetorik-) Blumen, welche im Garten des Cicero stehen. Ist Scogan der Verfasser, so weicht er von Chaucer ebenso weit nach der derben Seite ab, wie Gower nach der moralisierenden. Er schreibt in Chaucers *rhyme royal*, aber mit minder reinen Reimen. . . . Sicher beglaubigt ist von Henry Scogan eine Adresse in demselben Metrum *An die Lords des Königlichen Hauses*, d.h. an die Söhne Heinrichs IV., geschrieben im Auftrag ihres Vaters, wohl gegen 1413, um sie zur Tugend zu ermahnen. Darin erscheint Scogan als altes Hausmöbel der Lancasters; vielleicht hatte schon sein früheres Werk, gleich Chaucers *Klage des Mars*, dem alten Herzog John Spass gemacht."



An examination of these hypotheses may bring out some facts of interest. For convenience I shall follow the order of Brandl's exposition.

At the outset it is perhaps worth while to observe that Chaucer's *Envoy*, though it certainly seems to include Scogan among "them that ben hore and rounde of shape That ben so lykly folk in love to spede," nowhere calls him a poet, and does not necessarily imply that his offence against the god of love was committed by way of a poem. Further, Professor Brandl has certainly misunderstood Chaucer's language with regard to the nature of Scogan's offence. "These pestilential rains," says Chaucer, "are in great part due to the tears shed by Venus for thy sin, Scogan." What this sin is, the lines that follow indicate with sufficient definiteness:—

Hast thou not seyde, in blasphem of this goddes,  
Through pryde, or through thy grete rakelnesse,  
Swich thing as in the lawe of love forbode is:  
That, for thy lady saw nat thy distresse,  
Therfor thou yave hir up at Michelmesse?  
Allas, Scogan! of olde folk ne yonge  
Was nevere erst Scogan blamed for his tonge!

Thou drowe in scorn Cupyde eek to record  
Of thilke rebel word that thou hast spoken,  
For which he wol no lenger be thy lord. (Vv. 15-24.)

What Scogan had done, then, was something very different from putting into the mouth of Cupid "einen lästerlichen, übermüthigen, im Liebeskodex verbotenen Ausspruch." He had, on the contrary, given utterance in his own person to sentiments forbidden "in the law of love." He had declared that, since "his lady" refused to regard his "distress," he "gave her up" and abandoned her service. To make this act of renunciation as formal as possible, Scogan had mentioned a definite date—Michaelmas—at which it took (or was to take) effect, and had called Cupid himself to witness<sup>1</sup> "thilke rebel word." This obtestation was "in scorn" of Cupid, for the renunciation was flat rebellion against his law. It was the plain duty

---

<sup>1</sup> This is the only conceivable meaning of "Thou drowe . . . Cupyde eek to record Of thilke rebel word that thou hast spoken."



of a vassal of the god of love to remain faithful to his chosen lady, no matter how disdainful or unconscious she might be, asking no reward beyond the privilege of being her servant: and even that privilege he was to regard as far beyond his deserts. "Many a man hath known his lady twenty years without winning even a kiss," says Pandarus:—

What shulde he therefore fallen in despeyr,  
Or be recreaunt of his owne tene,  
Or slen him self, al be his lady feyr?  
Nay, nay! but ever in oon be fressh and grene  
To serven and love his dere hertes quene,  
And thenk it is a guerdon hire to serve  
A thowsand fold more than he can deserve. *Troilus*, i, 813 ff.<sup>1</sup>

The fault of Scogan, then, was grave enough, and was aggravated by his defiance in calling the god to witness. Venus is moved to tears, and Cupid "will no longer be his lord."

Scogan's apostasy may have been announced merely by word of mouth or may have been put in the form of an elaborate (and highly conventional) poem. In neither case can it have anything to do with *The Court of Love*, in which nobody renounces the service of Cupid,—in which, on the contrary, the author, "Philogenet of Cambridge clerk," represents himself as offering his allegiance to the god and as devoting himself to the service of Rosiall, the heroine of the piece. That the particular passage in *The Court of Love* on which Brandl chiefly relies,—the objectionable statute, vv. 435 ff.,—is not to the purpose, is now clear. This statute may be sufficiently described by saying that it imposes on the lover as a duty a feat similar to that which Oliver is called upon to perform at Constantinople in fulfilment of his rash and extraordinary boast (*Charlemagne's Journey*, 486–9, 714 ff.). To put such a statute

<sup>1</sup> So Troilus writes to Cressid, who has failed to keep her day: "Yf ony servant dorste or oughte of ryght Upon his lady pytously compleyne," and "But for as muche as I mot nedes lyke Al that yow lyst, I dar not pleyne more." *Troilus*, v, 1345–46, 1352–53. The statutes in *The Court of Love* also insist on this duty (see vv. 316 ff., 344 ff., 367 ff.). It is useless to multiply examples. An excellent summary of the duties of the lover is the sermon of the *papegay* in Jean de Condé's *Messe des Oisais*, 204 ff., Scheler, *Dits et Contes de Baud. de Condé et de Jean de Condé*, III, 7–9.

into the mouth of the god of love may or may not have been an offense to make Venus weep and Cupid cashier the offender; but it certainly was not the offense for which Chaucer jestingly reproved his friend in the *Envoy to Scogan*.

With the correction of this error the whole of Professor Brandl's theory of Scogan's connection with *The Court of Love* falls to the ground. For the further correspondences which he mentions would be insignificant, even if they were all real parallels. "Philogenet" nowhere speaks of himself as "über die Jahre der Liebe hinaus." And the verses about the rhetorical flowers of Tully (The blosmes fresshe of Tullius garden soote, 8) have nothing in common with Chaucer's

Yet, Scogan, thenk on Tullius kyndesse :

Minne thy frend ther it may fructifye! (47-48)

except the name of Cicero. "Philogenet" may have had his eye on *The Franklin's Prologue*, 11-18 (F. 719-26), but disclaimers such as he makes are by no means uncommon.

Brandl's hypothesis, again, is in flat contradiction to the forms of language in *The Court of Love*. The poem, as is well known, does not contain a single final *-e* that is sounded in the interior of the verse, and the rhymes show a similar disregard for that sound, violating as they do all of Chaucer's rules. Scogan's genuine poem, however, the address *To the Lords of the King's House*, contains several such *-e*'s in the interior of the verse, and is fairly observant of Chaucerian canons in rhyme. Yet Brandl thinks that the *Court* was written as early as 1393 and the *Address* some twenty years later, "wohl gegen 1413." This would indicate that Scogan's language and grammar became more archaic the older he grew. But, indeed, we are not reduced to weighing differences of a decade or two. The *Court* is shown by linguistic evidence to belong to the end of the fifteenth century or the beginning of the sixteenth. In other words, it was not written till Scogan had been dead nearly a hundred years.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> According to Skeat "the original MS. copy" of *The Court of Love* exists in MS. R. 3. 19 in Trinity College, Cambridge, and the writing is later than 1500: *Minor Poems*, p. xxxi. Cf. a similar remark in his note in the revised edition of Bell's Chaucer, IV, 279. Apparently, however, he does not mean that an autograph MS. of the poem is extant.

The one genuine work of Scogan that has come down to us is entitled in Shirley's MS. (Ashmole 59 in the Bodleian Library): "A moral balade made by Henry Scogan squyer. Here folowethe nexst a moral balade to my lorde the Prince, to my lord of Clarence, to my lord of Bedford, and to my-lorde of Gloucester; by Henry Scogan, at a souper of feorthe merchande [*sic*] in the vyntre in London, at the hous of Lewys Iohan." In the black letter folios the title is merely: "Scogan, vnto the Lordes and Gentilmen of the Kinges house."<sup>1</sup> This poem is not, like *The Court of Love*, in rhyme royal (seven-line stanzas rhymed *ababbcc*), but in eight-line stanzas rhymed *ababbcbc*. Stow's account of the poem seems to have been derived from Shirley's MS. His words are: "For the Vintrie, to end therewith, I read, that in the reign of Henry IV. the young Prince Henry, Thomas Duke of Clarence, John Duke of Bedford, and Humfrey Duke of Glocester, the King's sons, being at supper among the merchants of London in the Vintrie, in the house of Lewes John; Henry Scogan sent to them a ballad beginning thus: 'My noble sonnes,' [etc.]. Then follow, in like metre, twenty-three staves, containing a perswasion from losing of time foolishly, in lust and vice, but to spend the same in vertue and godliness; as ye may read in Geffry Chaucer his works, lately printed [*i.e.* in Stow's ed., 1561, fo. cccxxxiii, back; but the piece had been published in Thynne's ed., 1532]." Stow, *Survey of London*, ed. 1720, bk. iii, pp. 2-3; ed. Thoms, 1842, p. 90. This adds nothing except Stow's explanation of *feorthe merchande*. Brandl dates the poem, as we have seen, "wohl gegen 1413," following Skeat, *Minor Poems*, p. lxxv, n. 4, who remarks that the verses "must have been written not many years before 1413, the date of the accession of Henry V. In 1405, the ages of the princes were 17, 16, 15, and 14 respectively."<sup>2</sup> In his account of the author, Skeat contents himself with

---

<sup>1</sup> The *Address* was first printed by Caxton (1479?), with the title: "Hire after foloweth a trefyse whiche Iohn Skogan sente vnto the lordes and gentilmen of the kynges hows exortyng them to lose no tyme in theyr yougthe, but to use Vertues": see Hazlitt, *Handbook*, 1867, p. 534; *Notes and Queries*, 7th Series, VI, 326.

<sup>2</sup> "Shirley's title to the poem was evidently written after 1415, as John was not created Duke of Clarence until that year." Skeat, *ibid.* John was never created Duke of Clarence. He was created Duke of Bedford in 1414 (Dugdale, *Baron-*

distinguishing Henry Scogan from the reputed author of *The Jests of Scoggin*,<sup>1</sup> but does not attempt to fix any definite dates for his birth or death. The poem itself informs us that Scogan was master or tutor ("father") to the sons of the King. The opening lines, from which we learn of this relation, seem to have misled Brandl. At any rate, there is nothing else in the address to the princes which can have suggested to him that the poem was written "im Auftrag ihres Vaters." The lines in question are these:—

My noble sonnes and eke my lordes dere  
I your father called vnworthilie  
Sende vnto you this litle treatise here  
Written with mine owne hande full rudelie.

That the author regarded himself as an old man appears from the second stanza:

I complain me sore when I remembre me  
The sodein age that is vpon me fall.

We are not, however, so destitute of external evidence about Henry Scogan as the silence of the editors and biographers of Chaucer might lead one to infer. That the following bits of evidence have dropped out of sight is due, not to their inaccessibility, but to the fact that nobody felt sufficient interest in them to keep them in mind.

In 15 Rich. II. (June 22, 1391 to June 21, 1392) is recorded the *inquisitio post mortem* on the estate of John Scoggan of Norfolk. The entry in the *Calendarium Inquisitionum post Mortem*, p. 138, reads: "Joh'es Scoggan capellanus. Est Reynham maner' vocat' Hanyles ut de castro de Norwic'."

---

age, 1676, II, 200; *Rotuli Parliamentorum*, IV, 17); and at the same time his brother Humphrey received the title of Duke of Gloucester (*Rot. Parl.*, *ibid.*). Thomas, second son of Henry IV., had been made Duke of Clarence in 1412 (Dugdale, II, 196).

<sup>1</sup> On John Scogan, the reputed author of the jests, see Hazlitt, *Jest-Books*, II, 38-161, 357; Collier, *Registers of the Stationers' Company*, I, 120; Shakspeare Var. of 1821, XVII, 117-19; Tyrwhitt, *Account of the Works of Chaucer*, prefixed to his *Glossary*; Furnivall, *Andrew Boorde's Introduction*, p. 31; Furnivall, *Captain Cox*, pp. xlviij, lxvii; Nares, *Glossary*; Halliwell, *Dict. of O. Eng. Plays*, p. 221; *Dialect Notes*, Amer. Dialect Soc., pt. I, 1890, p. 23.



In 9 Henry IV. (Sept. 30, 1407 to Sept. 29, 1408) is recorded the *inquisitio* on the estate of Henry Scogan, who died seized of the same manor, "Hanviles maner' in Reinham," Norfolk, that had belonged to John Scoggan. But the inventory of his real estate is much longer than that of his predecessor. He is recorded as having been possessed of "messuag' etc. ibm vocat' Reinhams Ward" and of "houses [misprinted Rouses] et tenement' in Reinham, Reinham Sanct' Margar' et Reinham Sanct' Martin', Helweton," etc. (*Calendarium*, p. 315).

From the Issue Roll of the same year (9 Henry IV., Michaelmas) it appears that James Byllyngford had the marriage of the heir of Henry Scogan (Devon, *Issues of the Exchequer*, Henry III. to Henry VI., p. 306). This shows that the heir was a minor. Two years later, however (11 Henry IV.), the *Calendarium Inquisitionum post Mortem* contains the entry: "Robertus Scogan. Probat' etat'. Norfolk'" (p. 331), which indicates that in that year Robert Scogan came of age and sued his livery.

Most of the entries just enumerated were examined long ago by Parkin, whose investigations antedate the publication of the *Calendarium*. Parkin consulted the rolls themselves, of course, and therefore his observations supplement in some important particulars the evidence presented above. His discoveries and inferences are embodied in the following paragraph in vol. VII of the *Essay towards a Topographical History of the County of Norfolk*,<sup>1</sup> 1807, pp. 141-2:

"In 1391 John Scoggan (capellane) aforesaid died seized of the manor of Haviles, and Henry his brother was found to be his heir (as is proved by the eschaet-rolls), aged 30; and the said Henry occurs lord in 1395, and held it by the service of paying 40 s. per ann. to Norwich Castle . . . : this Henry died seized of it in 1407, and Robert was his son and heir aged 19 years. This was I presume that Henry Scoggan, famous for his wit and humour in the time of King Henry IV. who wrote a ballad directed (as Stow informs us) to Prince Henry, the king's son, Thomas Duke of Bedford, and Humphrey Duke of Gloucester, at supper with the merchants of London; an author out of whom the said historian (as'

<sup>1</sup> The collection known as "Blomefield's Norfolk."

he tells us<sup>1</sup>) gathered materials, and was buried in the cloisters of Westminster Abbey.<sup>2</sup> Robert Scoggan above-mentioned was lord of Haviles in 1409 . . . ; and in 1414, released to Henry Maupas, clerk, etc., all his manors, lands, and tenements here and elsewhere, in Norfolk, which formerly belonged to John Scoggan his uncle, and Henry his father."<sup>3</sup>

We are now able to correct Brandl's date for Scogan's genuine poem. The *Address* was not written "gegen 1413," for the author died in 1407. It is clear, too, that Brandl has somewhat misconceived the station of the poet, whom he calls "altes Hausmöbel der Lancasters." Scogan seems to have been a landed gentleman of substance, — not a superannuated dominie.

Further, the dates which we have ascertained throw some light on Chaucer's epistle. If Scogan was but thirty years old when he succeeded his brother as lord of the manor in 1391, he was only thirty-two when Chaucer addressed to him the celebrated *Envoy*, if that was written in 1393. This at first shakes one's confidence in the date usually assigned to Chaucer's poem; for it is hard to see how Chaucer can have regarded a man of thirty-two as old enough to be classed with himself (then fifty-three at least) as "hoar and round of shape," and as therefore unlikely to succeed in love. But it should be observed that it by no means follows from the *Envoy* that

---

<sup>1</sup> Parkin's authority for this remark was doubtless the presence of Scogan's name in the "Catalogue of Authors, Records, and Manuscripts, venerable for Antiquity, out of which the Truth of those worthy ancient Matters contained in this book is excerpted," prefixed to Stow's *Survey*, ed. of 1720, I, xxvii. But the excerpt on the strength of which Scogan is included in this list is perhaps merely the stanza quoted by Stow from the *Address to the Lords* (*Survey*, ed. 1720, bk. iii, pp. 2-3). At any rate the *Catalogue* also contains the names of Socrates, Lucan, Chaucer, and Lydgate.

<sup>2</sup> Parkin cites Stow's *Survey*, ed. of 1720, vol. II, book vi, p. 15, where the entry is "In the Cloister, Henry Scogan, a learned Poet."

<sup>3</sup> A writer in *Notes and Queries*, 7th Ser., VII, 17-18, has collected some of the same facts: "A John Scogan, who died in 1391, was succeeded in the lordship of the manor of Hanyles (? Haviles), in East Rainham, co. Norfolk, by his brother Henry, who appears a few years later, viz. 9 Hen. IV, as owner of this and other property in the same parish. This was doubtless our poet, and at his death (11 Hen. IV) the estate passed to his son Robert." This writer does not mention his authorities. He errs, it will be noticed, in putting the death of Henry Scogan in 11 Hen. IV: that was the year in which Robert Scogan came of age.

Scogan actually was gray-haired and corpulent and "über die Jahre der Liebe hinaus." Indeed, the answer which Chaucer puts into the mouth of his friend: "Lo! olde Grissel<sup>1</sup> list to ryme and pleye [*i.e.* jest]!" is just such a rejoinder as a young man might well make to a friend twenty years his senior<sup>2</sup> who had jocosely included him with himself in the class of antiquated gallants. We have here one more warning against assuming that Chaucer is in dead earnest in the personal allusions found here and there in his poems.

We may conclude then: (1) that Scogan had nothing to do with *The Court of Love*, (2) that his *Address to the Lords* cannot be later than 1407, and (3) that Chaucer's *Envoy* is too jocose a document to be used as biographical evidence at all.

GEORGE LYMAN KITTREDGE.

---

<sup>1</sup> For the phrase, cf. the words of Venus to Gower, *Conf. Amantis*, bk. viii, ed. Pauli, III, 356: "And though thou feigne a yong corage, It sheweth well by thy visage, That *olde grisel* is no fole."

<sup>2</sup> It is worth mentioning that Scogan's tone in referring to "his master Chaucer" in the *Address to the Lords* is strikingly like that elsewhere adopted by Lydgate and Hoccleve, both men much younger than Chaucer.

## ETYMOLOGICAL NOTES.

### 1. FRENCH *Traître*.

KÖRTING in his *Lateinisch-romanisches Wörterbuch, Nachtrag*, no. 8291, says: "Neumann, Z. XIV, 573, ist geneigt, frz. *traître*, *traître* aus \**tradictor* zu erklären, da *traditor* \**traïre* hätte ergeben müssen. Aber das *t* in *traître* kann wohl auf halbgelehrter Rückbildung an *traditor* beruhen." I wish first to correct this passage somewhat, and then to make some additions to it, giving more fully a view like that here expressed by Körting, with the reasons which led me some years ago to take *traditor* and not *tradictor* as the source of the French word.

From the words I have quoted one might suppose that Neumann was the first to propose *tradictor*, and that he considered it the most probable source. His words however are: "*traditor* genügt übrigens nicht als Etymon von *traître*: wie *imperator emperere* hätte jenes *traïre* nicht *traître* ergeben müssen. Irgendwo ist einmal — wenn ich mich recht erinnere von Rothenberg — *tradictor* vorgeschlagen, das mir der Erwägung wert erscheint." Though Neumann did not mark the quantity of the *i*, he of course meant a secondary form *traditor*, for which he offered no explanation, instead of the classic *traditor*. I shall propose such an explanation presently. Now the first proposer of *tradictor* was apparently Willenberg; see his notice in the *Literaturblatt*, V, 192, with his reference to his own "Erklärung" in Herrig's *Archiv*, LXIII, 119, where may be found the words: "Die Angabe, dass *traïtor* = *traditor* sei, ist doppelt fehlerhaft, denn ein Mal hätte mindestens *traditorem* als Etymon angegeben werden müssen, aber auch dies wäre nicht richtig, obwohl es sich bei Diez, Wtb.<sup>3</sup> 421, s.v. *tradire* gleichfalls findet; vielmehr ist für den Nom. *tradictor* (altfr. *traï[s]tre*) zu Grunde zu legen, da bei jener Ableitung das *t* hätte ausfallen müssen."

It is conceivable that Körting knew of this etymology when first proposed by Willenberg and that he made no mention of it because no arguments of value were advanced in support of it. I assume



that the idea in the proposer's mind was that *traditor* suffered influence from *dicere* or *dictor* so as to become *tradictor*, the word thus expressing, by a sort of popular etymology, that a traitor was one who *said* something treasonable, for otherwise I am unable to see why a form with inserted *c* was assumed. This would be intelligible, but before giving *tradictor* as more than a barely possible conjecture one ought to advance some argument or present some evidence to show that this possible change actually happened or very likely happened. The invention of Low Latin forms without sufficient reason ought to be frowned upon. So far as I am aware neither Willenberg nor any one else has given any good reason for supposing *tradictor* ever to have existed. But since the suggestion has been revived by Neumann, it may be well to state some objections to it.

1. A word *tradictor*, formed as described above, should have a short *i* in Latin, or a close *e*, not *i*, in the late Latin of Gaul. The O. Fr. descendant of it would regularly be *traictre*, not *traître*, nor the bad spelling *traïstre* which Willenberg mentions. It would require a Latin *tradictor* (if we must have the *c*), with a close *i* in Low Latin to explain O. Fr. *traître* (or else a Latin *tradētor*, which need not be discussed), and that would assume a Latin participle *dīctum*, while, as is well known, *dīctum* was used in Gaul; cf., for example, Neumann's remark in Gröber's *Zeitschrift*, XIV, 584-585, on § 483 of Schwan's *Grammatik*.

2. Such a supposed influence of *dicere* or *dictor* ought to be made more plausible than by the mere possibility of such a change of meaning as that spoken of above. Thus *dictor* ought to be shown to have been a not uncommon word in late Latin, or a verb *tradicere* ought to be found, if possible with the meaning 'to say treasonably,' 'to reveal secrets,' or something similar. If a simple *dictor* is not to be found in common use, then compounds would do as well if several were found used with some frequency. If I were arguing for *tradictor*, I suspect the best argument I could find would be to urge that *contradictor* might have been misunderstood as a compound of *con* and *tradictor*, and I certainly should not venture to urge that seriously. From an examination of dictionaries it appears that *dictor* alone or in composition was probably rare, while *tradicere* is no more to be found than *tradictor*. Of course this does not prove the non-existence of *tradicere*.

It is true that *tradere* was influenced to some extent by another word, but this was *dare*, as the Roumanian *trădă* and the Provençal *tradar* pointing to *tradare* show (on a further confusion with *trahere* in Prov. see Diez, *Wört.*, s.v. *tradire*). I know of no evidence that indicates such an influence of *dicere*.

3. If, in order to claim *traître* as of popular origin we assume a form *tradictor*, why not go a little farther and assume the popular form of the prefix *trans*, namely *tras*, in vulgar Latin? Would not *trasdictor* be a likely formation in popular Latin? Yet this is impossible as the source of *traître*. To be sure, if the word *traditor* was changed in the last part, it is not necessary to assume that the first part was recognized as the same as *trans*, but is it not likely, assuming that the last part was changed, that the real cause of it was that the word was not really common and popular in the first place? If so, why search at all for any etymology but *traditor*, and why not admit at once that the word is of semi-learned origin? Indeed, even if the first syllable was not, so to speak, detected as *'trans*, would it not still, according to the theory I am opposing, have been likely to be felt as a compound of *dictor*, and therefore might it not, as a popular word, have retained its *d* as well as its *t*, the *d* being treated as initial?

This brings us back to the old etymology, and it only remains to suggest an explanation of the loss of the *d* while the *t* is retained. I assume that after *tradere* had changed its conjugation and the *d* had taken the spirant pronunciation *ð* (= Paris's *ð* as used in the third edition of his *Extraits de la Chanson de Roland*), that *traditor* was adopted, naturally, on account of its obvious connection with the verb, with the *d* pronounced *ð* as in the verb, and with the accent on the *i*. It must have been a word adopted rather early, i.e. in late vulgar Latin, otherwise the final syllable of *traditor* would have received the accent in French. The rest follows regularly: the *ð* disappeared in Old French when the other *ð*'s disappeared, while the *t* was retained as *t*, and we thus get the old form *traître*, modern *traître*. It should be added that the new infinitive *tradire* appears to have been a generally accepted form, except in Roumanian; cf. Prov. and Cat. *traïr*, Port. *trahir* (Span. probably once *traïr*; cf. the noun *traidor*, and the Port. verb), Ital. *tradire*, while the forms for 'traitor' are at least as well explained by *traditor*, *-orem*, as by

*traditor*; cf. Ital. *traditore*, Span. and Port. *traidor*, Prov. *traïre*, *traïdor*. The Prov. forms indeed point unmistakably to *-ïtor*, *-orem*; see also Thomas's article in the *Romania* XXI (particularly pp. 11, 14, 17; *debitor* and *traditor* are parallel cases, except for the influence of the new infinitive *tradire*). The Span. and Port. forms were not necessarily adopted at the same time as the French and Prov. forms, and we need not assume that any but the French forms were semi-learned.

It should be added that Darmesteter's foot-note, *Romania* V, 156, was perhaps my starting-point when I considered the etymology of this word, and a reference to his note would have been proper enough for *traditio* and for *traditor* in Körting's work. The index to the first ten volumes of the *Romania* has the reference for *trahison*, but not for *trahitre*.

It is noteworthy that Fr. *trahison*, with *a* and *i* in different syllables, still keeps up the connection with *trahir*, while *trahitre* does not, *a* and *i* having been contracted; apparently because the ending *-tre*, not resembling the usual ending of nouns of agency, prevented the word from being felt as a derivative from the verb. Had the O. Fr. object case of this word been the one preserved (as is the case in English *traitor*; cf. the Middle English forms), perhaps the form would now be *trahiteur*. In English, on the contrary, which has all three words (*be-tray*, *treason*, *traitor*), the case appears to be reversed, *traitor* having the same vowel sound in the first syllable as *betray* has in the second, while *treason* corresponds in its first syllable to *treat* (= O. Fr. *traitier*, Fr. *traïter*), as *traitor* possibly would do but for the influence of *betray*. But perhaps the sound in *traitor* is not due to this influence, but is caused by the later adoption of the word in English, *treason* having the original diphthong contracted into a monophthong (*è*) before *traitor* was naturalized in English, while *traitor* came in as a word of three syllables, and its *aï* simply became in Middle English the diphthong *ai*, which explains the modern sound.

## 2. FRENCH *Suite*.

The word is not in Diez's *Etym. Wörterbuch* nor in Körting's *Lateinisch-romanisches Wörterbuch*, but its explanation is by no means so simple as not to be worth a brief discussion. It has been



apparently supposed to be a participial substantive from *suivre*. But *secuta* does not explain the form, for this should give in O. Fr. *seüe*, with no *t* (cf. *seü*, participle of O. Fr. *sivre*, and *seür* = *securus*), and Littré's etymon *secta* would only give the O. Fr. *site*, not *suite*. In Godefroy, s.v. *sieute*, are given several spellings, such as *suyte*, *siute*, *seute*, *site* (with the meaning 'poursuite'), and these forms, together with the meanings of the word compared with those of *secta* in Low Latin, point to the conclusion that the French word is due to *sēcta* influenced by *suivre*. *Suivre* itself properly would have the *ui* only in certain forms, where it stands for the earlier diphthong *iu*, as in *jo siu*, *tu sius*, *il siut*. Skeat, Etym. Dict., s.v. *suit*, follows Littré in deriving *suite* directly from *secta*, and the Century dictionary gives the word, with corresponding forms in other Romance languages, as coming from Low Latin *secuta*, *sequuta*, \**sequita* (the last form with no accent or vowel quantity marked, but apparently meant to explain Span. *seguida*), with no notice of the violation of phonetic law involved. But there is no need of inventing a Low Latin form to explain the French word, for the forms preserved are quite sufficient to make everything clear, as I think I have shown. If this explanation is correct, then the article *sēctā* in Körting's work should be extended so as to take in O. Fr. *site* and *suite* as well, and the words "überall nur gelehrtes Wort" can be omitted. Cf. also the meanings and uses of Ital. *setta*, which perhaps was not only learned.

### 3. ENGLISH *Cruise*.

This word shows an irregular development in English, for we should expect it to be *croise*, as coming from O. Fr. *croisier*. As a suggestion only I present the following. It is conceivable that the Anglo-French form *cruiser*, for O. Fr. *croisier* (with a close *o*, whether accented or not), may have been preserved in spelling and then have influenced the pronunciation of some to whose dialect the word was at first strange, as being a nautical term. Such persons would then pronounce the *ui* after *r* as they pronounced the O. Fr. diphthong *üi* in the same position, and if this pronunciation spread, the final result might be to produce the same sound as in *fruit* (= O. Fr. *fruit*), that is, our present pronunciation. A similar explanation may be offered for the *u* in the words *demure* (if from the O. Fr. form of modern Fr. *mœurs*), *tune* compared with *tone*, and *gules*, *rescue*.



4. ENGLISH *Jewel*.

The derivation of this word, through the O. Fr. form of modern French *joyau*, from *gaudiellum* is unsatisfactory. Even if we can derive O. Fr. *joel*, *jouel* from *gaudiellum*, a point to which I shall revert presently, the English form is irregular, for we ought to have, not *jewel*, but *jowel*, rhyming with *vowel*, or possibly with *Lowell*, if we assume that the *o*, = Lat. *au*, preserved its open quality in the unaccented syllable in Middle English. And the O. Fr. form itself should be *joiel* rather than *joel*, *jouel* (the cases with *i* in O. Fr. are some if not all like *biaus* = *bellus*, and point simply to the suffix *-ellum*) ; see *Romania* XVIII, 544. Meyer-Lübke, *Grammatik d. roman. Sprachen* I, § 510, gives no clear statement, and no French example for intervocal *di* before the accent and following *au* or *o*. Körting, *Lat.-roman. Wörterbuch*, favors *jocalis*, but neither he nor previous proposers of this appear to have noticed that the O. Fr. form points to suffix *-ellum*, as do also the Prov. forms *joiel*, *joel* (see for Fr. the word in rhyme in several examples in Godefroy). But for this objection *jocalis* might pass ; the *y* of the modern form would then be as in *voyelle*, compared with English *vowel*, which points to an O. Fr. *voel* or *voele*, which must have existed (*vocalis* is not in Körting's book), the *c* being lost in O. Fr. as in *jouer* = *jocare*, *jocari* ; cf. also *joaillier*. Moreover, Godefroy, s.v. *joiel*, actually gives the meanings *jeu*, *enjeu*, and some of the phrases he gives may perhaps be explained by the sense of *jeu*, at least as well as by that of *joyau*. The connection in sense between *jocus* and *gaudium* is not remote, and a derivative from the former word might get the sense of 'jewel,' perhaps from the jewel's being regarded as a toy, a plaything. I think the O. Fr. word is a diminutive, formed from *jeu*, or some other dialect form of the word, and in French influenced by other derivatives from the same root which did not accent the *o* of *jocus*, such as *jouer*. It could not have come direct from a vulgar Latin *jocellum*, for this would not have simply dropped the *c*. The insertion of the *i* may have been assisted by actual confusion with *joie* or derivatives from *gaudium* or *gaudere*, this verb giving forms without the diphthong *oi*, and being thus peculiarly adapted to cause a confusion in the forms. If we now assume either that there was originally a diminutive form *jeuel*, *gieuel*, *giuel*, or *jüel*, or that the

primitive later caused its own vowel or diphthong to appear in the first syllable of the diminutive, we have the explanation of the English word, for the O. Fr. diphthongs concerned gave in English the same result as the French vowel *ü*, as also does an original *üeu* or *üieu* in two syllables (*Jew* = *gieu*, *jueu* or *juieu*, though it might indeed represent the O. Fr. nom. pl. *juü* = *Judaei*, so far as the form goes). For similar cases of the vowel or diphthong of the accented syllable in the simple French word showing in the English form, cf. *fuel*, *utas*.

E. S. SHELDON.



Fig. 1.



Fig. 2.



Fig. 3.





## MANTEGNA'S TRIUMPH OF CÆSAR IN THE SECOND PART OF FAUST.

SINCE, in 1881, Ludwig Friedländer discovered that the anchorites in *Bergschluchten, Wald, Fels, Einöde* were suggested by one of the frescoes in the Campo Santo of Pisa,<sup>1</sup> a number of attempts have been made to find in other scenes of the second part of *Faust* traces of Goethe's poetic imagination having been stimulated by the contemplation of works of art. Strangely enough, however, a scene, the very central action of which reminds one of one of Holbein's most celebrated pictures, has not yet been considered from this point of view.

Whether Holbein's Triumph of Plutus did indeed inspire Goethe with the conception of the Mummenschanz-procession of Plutus-Faust, is a question which I am at present not prepared to decide. That several details of this scene were suggested by another famous masterpiece of painting, Mantegna's Triumph of Cæsar, may be demonstrated from Goethe's own words.

Few works of art ever made a greater impression on Goethe. In 1823 he published two articles on Mantegna in *Kunst und Alterthum* (*Werke*, Hempel, 28, 482 ff.), giving a sketch of his career, analyzing his style, and describing with wonderful clearness and artistic insight his Triumph of Cæsar, in which, as Goethe says, "er Alles, was ein grosses Talent vermochte, in höchster Fülle vorüberführt" (*l.c.* p. 485).

There are three passages in this description which at once suggest characters appearing in Goethe's own representation of the triumph of Plutus.

1. Plate 7 (*l.c.* p. 487): "Zunächst gegen den Zuschauer geht ein Fräulchen von acht bis zehn Jahren an der Mutter Seite, so schmuck und zierlich als bei dem anständigsten Feste." It is hard

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Dehio, *Alt-italienische Gemälde als Quelle zum Faust*. *Goethe-Jahrbuch*, VII, 251 ff.

not to see an affinity of this characterization with the manner in which in the *Mummenschanz* the pair "Mutter und Tochter" are introduced, l. 566 ff. :—

Mädchen, als du kamst ans Licht,  
Schmückt ich dich im Häubchen,  
Warst so lieblich von Gesicht  
Und so zart am Leibchen.  
Dachte dich sogleich als Braut,  
Gleich dem Reichsten angetraut,  
Dachte dich als Weibchen.

. . . . .  
Welches Fest man auch ersann,  
Ward umsonst begangen; etc.

Undoubtedly there is a radical difference between the two scenes. In Mantegna's painting a noble matron and her little child, bearing with calm serenity the sad circumstances which surround them; in the *Mummenschanz* a frivolous matchmaker angling for an opportunity of marrying off her equally coquettish daughter. And yet, the picture which the mother in the *Mummenschanz* gives of her daughter's youth is essentially the same as the one which we receive from Goethe's own description of Mantegna's mother and child. The appended sketch of the latter group (Fig. 1) will go to confirm this resemblance, although its dimensions are too small to give an idea of the mature, womanly expression of the little girl.

2. On the same plate (*l.c.*) : "Misgestaltete Narren und Posenreisser schleichen sich heran und verhöhnen die edlen [Unglücklichen]." An analogy to this is afforded in the *Mummenschanz* by the part played by the "Doppelzwerggestalt" of Zoilo-Thersites, assailing the participants in the procession, l. 845 ff. :—

Hu! Hu! da komm ich eben recht,  
Ich schelt euch allzusammen schlecht! etc.

The accompanying sketch of the hideous figure brought in by Mantegna (Fig. 2) cannot fail to recall the "eklen Klumpen" into which Goethe's Zoilo-Thersites is transformed through the blows of the indignant herald.

3. Plate 8 (*l.c.* p. 488) : "Ein wohlbehaglicher, hübscher Jüngling in langer, fast weiblicher Kleidung singt zur Leier und scheint

dabei zu springen und zu gestikuliren." Here again there is, in spite of essential differences, a marked resemblance to the appearance of the "Knabe Wagenlenker," the representative of poetry, of whom the herald says, l. 933 ff. : —

Und welch ein zierliches Gewand  
Fließt dir von Schultern zu den Socken,  
Mit Purpursaum und Glitzertand !  
Man könnte dich ein Mädchen schelten.

It is, then, not to be denied that in Goethe's own description of Mantegna's Triumph of Cæsar, written only a few years before his final return to the Faust poem, there are several traits which show an unmistakable likeness to certain scenes of his Triumph of Plutus.

Shall we go further than this? Shall we attempt to identify other figures or scenes of Mantegna's work with Goethe's Mummen-schanz? Even a slight comparison of the latter with the woodcuts of the former by Andrea Andreani, which were in Goethe's hands, or the magnificent photographic reproductions of the original paintings in Hampton Court by Ad. Braun-Dornach will show that such an attempt would be futile. Only two further points of similarity, one of them at least striking enough, may be worth mentioning.

The elephant on plate 5 with his long, snake-like, winding trunk, his back covered with richly ornamented tapestry, a youth riding on his neck and guiding him with a slender wooden hammer (cf. Fig. 3), is not unlike the elephant introduced by Goethe, l. 783 ff. : —

Ihr seht wie sich ein Berg herangedrängt,  
Mit bunten Teppichen die Weichen stolz behängt ;  
Ein Haupt mit langen Zähnen, Schlangenrüssel,  
Geheimnissvoll, doch zeig' ich euch den Schlüssel.  
Im Nacken sitzt ihm zierlich-zarte Frau,  
Mit feinem Stäbchen lenkt sie ihn genau.

And the manner in which the chariot of Plutus is drawn through the crowd without parting it, l. 899 ff. : —

Seht ihrs durch die Menge schweifen?  
Vierbespannt, ein prächtiger Wagen  
Wird durch alles durchgetragen ;  
Doch er theilet nicht die Menge —

reminds one somewhat of the way in which the chariot of Cæsar on plate 9 moves along, while naked children with laurel branches sport about between the wheels and the hoofs of the horses. "In der Wirklichkeit," says Goethe in his description of the scene (p. 488), "müssten sie längst zerquetscht sein."

Finally, I may add some information which I owe to the kindness of W. von Biedermann and H. Düntzer. The former, in a letter expressing his agreement with the conclusions set forth in this article, writes: "That Goethe in writing the Mummenschanz should have thought of Mantegna's Triumph is all the more plausible since the latter, hanging in one of his drawing-rooms, was almost daily before his eyes." Düntzer, although not willing to admit a connection between the painting and the poem, himself furnishes another argument for it by recalling the fact that Goethe made use of Mantegna's work in putting Shakespere's *Julius Cæsar* on the Weimar stage.<sup>1</sup>

KUNO FRANCKE.

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Briefe Schillers und Goethes an A. W. Schlegel*, p. 49.







PN  
35  
H3  
v.1

Harvard studies and notes  
in philology and literature

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE  
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

---

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY

---

